

BX 8065  
.G3  
Copy 1

**HAND - BOOK**  
**OF**  
**CHRISTIAN TRUTH**



Class BX8065

Book . G3

Copyright N<sup>o</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.





# HAND-BOOK OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH

A Guide for all that wish to  
know the Way of Salvation.

---

By HOWARD C. GARVIC, A. M.

Pastor of St. Mark's Luth. Church  
Atchison, Kans.



1913

GERMAN LITERARY BOARD  
BURLINGTON, IA.

BX 8065  
G3

Copyright, 1913  
By R. NEUMANN,  
Burlington, Ia.

1913

1913

To her  
Who is my companion.  
Whose fellowship I share,  
And whose help I have enjoyed

My Wife

This book is dedicated





## FORWORD.

In the writing of this little treatise we have had in mind two things: (1) to provide a brief, logical and suggestive statement of Christian doctrine; (2) and to present the same in conformity to positive Lutheran teaching.

It has been our desire to present a statement of Christian truth in such form as will, when properly used, facilitate the return, not only of the unsaved outside the church to a knowledge of the saving truth, but those within as well, to a deeper consciousness of its divine wealth. We aim to realize but one thing: the arousing of the mind and heart to serious thought upon the great fundamental facts of God's revelation.

That there is need of such, is beyond question. In a day when the material viewpoint predominates, not only is a neglect of God's word a natural consequence, but a neglect to contemplate the finer things of the soul follows as well. To aid the pastor who attempts to reach the present day man, by providing a hand-book on religion which he can place in his hands, is our desire.

This aim has very largely determined the form of our present effort. As such we have planned to make it intensive rather than extensive and hence have omitted detail which otherwise would have been included. The task of supplying this will fall to the pastor who can amplify it in a manner impossible within the scope of this book.

It is the direct outgrowth of our work among adults in trying to reach them for religious life and for the church. Here we have discovered the difficulty of interesting all whom we seek in any plan for Bible instruction, to be carried out at a stated time and place. Many things—as home duties, work, etc.—enter in to make this condition possible and necessitate some other means of reaching them. Ignorance of the Word

of God and indifference to the church make it difficult to get in touch with the man of today. It is such a condition and such a need that this hand-book anticipates. In size it is between the tract and the larger works abroad upon the teachings of Christianity. We have avoided on purpose the use of technical words and sentences as far as possible. Its language anticipates not only the man outside the church—and hence unaccustomed to many moral terms—but likewise the man who counts himself a Christian but who is lacking the stimulus of clean-cut convictions upon the great facts of his religion. While we have used Luther's Small Catechism as our guide throughout and have in many places used its exact language—as in Study 19—yet this hand-book does not lay any claim to being an explanation of the same. While we have altered the form and order of its teaching, we have not changed its substance or spirit. We have simply tried to adapt its teaching to the average man, by changing the form of its presentation.

With the prayer that God will use this little book, not only to the converting, but likewise to the edifying of many souls, we send it forth on its mission.

HOWARD C. GARVIC.

Atchison, Kansas, August 20, 1913.

## STUDY I.

### THE DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE.

II. Peter 1:21—"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

It is most natural that any study which anticipates the moral life and needs of man should begin with that of the Bible. It is preeminently the standard in all matters which pertain to the moral relations of the human soul, a fact which accounts in no small measure for the large place this book holds in the estimation of men. It is now and has been for no small time the center of his life and thought, not only because of its general contribution to his material well being, but more particularly in view of its witness upon the deeper and more profound problems of his heart.

Its place therefore in man's life is emphasized by its moral value to his interests; its power for him and with him is not incidental, but essential. His faith will rest upon the Bible then, because it is first grounded in it. Its hold upon his life is not the result of a mere passing sentiment but of conviction. He realizes that the day is long past when any apology is necessary in its behalf. Its witnesses are to be found in every clime; and its influence is contingent upon no imaginary line of geography. It is a universal book because it has a world-wide message that interprets the needs of the universal man.

It is no longer an open question as to whether we will give it a place in our considerations. We have come to see that it is an indispensable factor to human life and that its influence is felt in every nook and corner of man's effort. The modern question then is not how large a place I am willing to accord it, but how large a place does it claim. It not only claims a place in the field of literature, but in that of science as well. It asks to be heard not only in the halls of the university, but in the

counting house and in the marts of trade as well. It has been given a re-birth on the statute books of every civilized government of the world, and human rights have been guarded and preserved only as society has followed its leadership.

In size, it is a small book. It has been carried in the vest pocket in some instances; but in import, it is as big as eternity. In this little book man not only finds the way to heaven, but also the way to hell; it is not the guide to life only, but it likewise reveals the road to death.

### ITS NATIVITY.

Where was it born? How did it come to be in its present form? Is it the work of man unaided, or is it the product of man aided by divine power? Did it come down from the skies—a feature claimed by other sacred writings—or was its birth realized on the earth? These are questions that have had large interest for man, and which have disturbed him as he has come to estimate their place in the world,

We have been speaking of the Bible as a book. It is more than a book; it is a collection of little books, made up of 66 different books, written at different times and places,—some of the books being separated by more than 1000 years—and by different authors, it presents the greatest diversity in the most wonderful unity. These 66 books are divided into two parts: (1st) the Old Testament, consisting of 39 books written before the coming of Jesus Christ and narrating the history of God's chosen people in preparation for His coming; and (2nd) the New Testament consisting of 27 books written after His coming, and concerning themselves with the facts of His history.

To this collection of books, into one book, we have given the name 'Bible.' This name is taken from the Greek word, which means 'a book,' which in turn is derived from the character of the material upon which the writing was made, which was the Byblus or Papyrus, an Egyptian reed out of which the first paper was made.

This book has not come to us in its present form by mere

chance. It has a history. Imagine that before you is a quaint old chest, having three compartments. In the first of these compartments we see many papers yellow with age which we will call manuscripts. The date of their writing ranges anywhere from 300 A. D. to 450 A. D. These are copies of the originals which were lost during the awful persecution of the early church and contain in whole or in part our present Bible. These manuscripts are a result of the necessity of the times, and as the early church did not have the printing press as yet, the only way for one man to get a copy—say of the Gospels—was to either copy it himself or hire a scribe to do it for him. Thus fathers who had access to the original ones secured copies for their sons; also as churches began to multiply they demanded more copies and in this manner many manuscripts of the New Testament writings came into existence. These have been recovered from the old libraries, many of which have been dug out from under the ruins of the cities having them, and gathered into the museums of Europe so that today we have thousands of them at our command. These form the primary basis of our present Bible.

But the early church had her great preachers and interpreters of the divine word also. Among these we want to mention Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Origen,—the former one being a disciple of St. John who wrote the Fourth Gospel. History knows them as Church Fathers. They have left us their comments upon the life and teaching of Jesus Christ and consequently have quoted very largely from the New Testament books. These sayings of the Church Fathers we will put in the second compartment of the old chest as material for determining the nativity of our present Bible.

As the church grew, not only in the number of adherents but in the number of organizations, there was a demand, not for a few scattered copies of the New Testament writings but that they might as far as possible be gathered together into one book. After comparing the manuscripts one with the other and these then with the sayings of the Church Fathers, the



result is a single collection of the writings into one book. This we call a version. These we gather from the various churches of all time and place them in the third compartment of the old chest.

Now we have as the source from which to draw our material for our Bible, (1) **Manuscripts**; (2) **Sayings of the Church Fathers**; and (3) **the Various Versions of the Church**. When King James of England, appointed a company of men to give to the world a new edition—or version—of the Bible, this was the material at their command and the result of their effort was what is now known as the ‘King James’s Version’ of the Bible. This was finished in 1611 A. D. But that was many years ago,—over 300 years. Within this time many manuscripts as well as many comments by the Church Fathers were discovered which were not at hand at the time of the making of the King James Version. Among the new manuscripts discovered was one of great value—the Sinaitic manuscript,—and so named because it was discovered in an old monastery on Mt. Sinai. It takes us back to within 200 years of the time when St. John wrote the Fourth Gospel. With these facts before them another committee proceeded to make another edition of the Bible, and in 1881 gave to the world what is known as ‘The Revised Version of the Bible.’ The same method used in the production of the New Testament characterizes in the main, the collection of the books which form our Old Testament.

It is true that the early church witnessed the production of many other important and valuable writings upon the life and teachings of Jesus Christ which apparently are of equal value with the writings that compose our present Bible. This forces the question at this point, How did the present books come to find a place in our Bible? Why did the early church choose these specific books while casting out other writings apparently as important? Or, What is the rule or standard of measurement by which one book secured a place in the Bible, while another was cast out? This measuring rod, we call a ‘Canon.’

The Roman Catholic church says they are in the Bible because the church said so; their place in the sacred book is guaranteed and based on the authority of the church. On the other hand the Protestant church says they are there because of their special testimony to Jesus Chrst. The catholic accepts the Bible as the word of God because the church says so: the protestant because God, speaking in terms of Jesus Christ tells him so. The former asks, What does the church say? The latter, What does God say? The Protestant believes it to be God's Word because through it He has spoken to him in such manner as to convince him that it is God who speaks. This was the great test applied to the books of the Bible by Dr. Martin Luther. 'Does it concern itself with Christ or does it not?' was his measure of every book. This must have been in some manner the test likewise of the church of the first century.

### ITS NATURE.

While it is true within certain limits that the Bible is both a book and a collection of books, yet it is preeminently more than this. It is even more than a mere collection of religious books, a fact which likewise marks the literature of other religions and with which many times the Bible is confounded. Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism, each have their sacred writings; Mohammedianism has its Koran. None of these however, have the positive spiritual value—in fact many times lacking a clean, moral tone—such as characterizes the books of our Bible. Prof. Max Muller, the great writer on religions says, that the writings noted above—and they are the chief of the heathen writings—"contain much that is silly, artificial, even hideous and repellent." They are religious books, minus Jesus Christ.

**The Bible is the Word of God.** It does not simply contain His word, but it is **His word**. This is a distinction you must well keep in mind, for it marks a fact that no man searching after truth today can afford to overlook. This comes

“because these books which form our Bible are in direct connection with God’s historical revelation which culminated in Jesus Christ.” This is the rock upon which the church is founded; likewise society and government. It is not its peculiar type of literature, neither is it its moral tone simply that separates it from all other religious writings, but its disclosure of God in terms of Jesus Christ. It is the scarlet thread of the Cross that runs through the whole of the Bible, binding and uniting the books into one complete whole. It is vastly more than a mere collection of a few dissertations on the facts of common morality. It is more than the disclosure of even ideas—although new—about God. Its task was none other than to confront man with his God. This is the fact that has impressed the Truth upon us and made us to feel the power of its spirit. It is its moral value then, both for time and eternity, in terms of personal knowledge of Him as Savior and Lord, that constitutes its true influence with man. It is this value conceived and experienced that makes it indispensable and gives it its warrant in making claim upon his affections and interests. These books speak not simply as God **would** speak; they speak as **He does** speak. This is their guarantee to us that their voice is a divine one and not a mere human adaptation.

Its pages tell their own story: Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” It is then an inspired book, because it came from the hands of men chosen and directed by the Holy Spirit.

But if it is an inspired book, it will take an inspired reader to interpret the book. Do not think that the question of inspiration is a quibble over words. It is not concerned simply with sentences and phrases. These belong to rhetoric and are the play of the grammarian. Inspiration goes far deeper than these mere transient forms of speech. It is dependent upon more stable facts. Were it not for this fact, the Bible would—if we are to judge by human standards—long ago have passed into that class of writings which have lost their hold upon the human heart and no longer speak peace to his soul.



Its pages reveal a Christ who not only lives in the religious experience of millions today, but one who lived in history as well. Its Christ is not a mere creation of the feelings or mind of man. He is a creature of history. The realization of His presence in life is not the realization of a mere idea. It is the touch of a personal presence, templated in a human body, that has lived and moved among men.

Neither are the writers of the book which compose our Bible mere creatures of the imagination. They are not subjects of fiction but of historic fact. The scenes, events and personages of sacred history, are just as reliable and accounted for by just as strong evidence as any event or person described in secular history. The pages of the Bible reveal not myth, neither the wild inventions of fancy, but fact and truth.

It is this book which has pillowed the thrones of kings. It has been the pole star in the midnight of social life and order. It blazed a path of noon-day light across the face of the Dark Continent. It stilled the pulse of the martyrs of the first century church. It not only washes from the face of the toiler the wrinkles of care, but it wipes away also the tear for the weary. It not only guides the feet of the youth, but likewise guilds the brow of the aged saint with the gold of the setting sun. It writes across the threshold of every life, "mark the perfect man and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace." It is this book that challenges your manhood: that asks your faith: that demands your worship.

## A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF THE BIBLE.

### 1. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

#### 1. THE PENTATEUCH (Or the five books of Moses).

- a) Genesis;
- b) Exodus;
- c) Leviticus;
- d) Numbers;
- e) Deuteronomy.

#### 2. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

- a) Joshua; b, Judges; c, Ruth; d, First and Second Samuel; e, First and Second Kings; f, First and Second Chronicles; g, Ezra; h, Nehemiah.

3. THE POETICAL BOOKS

a) Job; b, Psalms; c, Proverbs; b, Ecclesiastes—or the Preacher; e, Song of Solomon.

4. THE PROPHETICAL BOOKS

A. The Major Prophets.

a) Isaiah; b, Jeremiah, (including lamentations); c, Ezekiel; d, Daniel.

B. The Minor Prophets.

a) Hosea; b, Joel; c, Amos; d, Obadiah; e, Jonah; f, Micah; g, Nahum; h, Habakkuk; i, Zephaniah; j, Haggai; k, Zechariah; l, Malachi.

II. THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

A. The Gospels.

a) Matthew—70 A. D.;  
b) Mark—66 A. D.;  
c) Luke—70 A. D.;  
d) John—90-100 A. D.;

B. The Acts of the Apostles—75-80 A. D.

2. THE DOCTRINAL BOOKS

A. The Epistles of St. Paul.

a) Romans—58 A. D.;  
b) I. and II. Corinthians—57 A. D.;  
c) Galatians—58 A. D.;  
d) Ephesians—60-63 A. D.;  
e) Philippians—60-63 A. D.;  
f) Colossians—60-63 A. D.;  
g) I. and II. Thessalonians—52 and 53 A. D.  
h) I. and II. Timothy—57 and 69 A. D.  
i) Titus—67 A. D.;  
j) Philemon—60-63 A. D.  
k) Hebrews—Indefinite.

B. The General Epistles.

a) James—45 or 62 A. D.;  
b) I. and II. Petter—64 and 68 A. D.  
c) I. and II. and III. John—90-100 A. D.;  
d) Jude—67-68 A. D.

3. THE PROPHETICAL BOOK

a) Revelation—by John the Apostle—68 or 95 A. D.

(The number opposite each book is the probable date of its writing.)

## STUDY II.

### THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

I. Corinthians 2:5—"That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

The thought of God is not only of supreme importance to man, but it is so because it is the central one in the Bible itself. Of all the great Truths which illumine its pages, that which relates to God is the greatest. It is at the bottom of all man's thinking on moral things and facts. It is the paramount consideration in all his activities.

There is no system of error extant today which, is not founded upon an erroneous conception of God. No Program, either modern or ancient, social or moral exists, which does not anticipate some conception of a Divine Being. Man's **whole** outlook upon the universe; his estimation of the physical facts about him; the mental feelings which stir him; and the value which he places upon himself, all are determined in their quality by what he conceives the character of their origin to be. It is highly important then, that we entertain right views and have true convictions about the being whom we call God. If correct knowledge of Him is essential to a right moral relationship with Him, it is highly necessary for man to exercise great care in the selection of a teacher and the source of the information which shall acquaint him with His character. Precaution here, will not be attended by difficulty when he comes to answer the questions that will arise relative to the character of his God.

#### HOW CAN I KNOW THERE IS A GOD?

This is a question that is fundamental with each of us. It faces us with one of the profoundest problems of human life. It is the great mystery of Truth. With some it seems to have no answer. But this is only apparent as a study of the facts will show.

When man thinks of himself, separate and distinct from his environment, he realizes that he is not essentially a part of it. That he is not the same either in degree or kind, with the physical facts around him, is a truth which he very early in life realizes. He recognizes that his environment is not his master; it is his servant. Thus he conceives of himself under quite a different and higher form of relationship: a form which he calls the moral. This relates him, not to the world of sense but to that of spirit. His origin then is not to be accounted for by the manipulation of physical laws but in the activity of spiritual ones.

He is supremely a moral spirit—a form under which man always recognizes himself, even in heathendom—and cannot be the product of a blind, unintelligent and non-moral force. It is this element of the moral in man that constitutes the unsolved problem of evolution in its attempt to overthrow God in his creation.

Man universal is conscious that he essentially is an effect of quite another cause than that advanced by the foes of the genetic account of his creation. He feels that he is the product of intelligence and a being whose nature he in no small way shares. He is a creature and not a thing, and his creator is reflected in his being.

This is evidenced by the world-wide tendency towards acts of worship. We can have cities without walls: governments without laws: but the tribe or race of people without its God, worship, prayer and an altar, is yet to be found. Say what you will this groping and searching to realize God, howsoever gross and crude be the form of its attempts, is very significant. It is not the product of a pagan superstition or ignorant sentiment, but of the soul's attempt to realize itself in its true and native relationship with its maker. In the higher scale of life, this groping ceases because supplanted with positive and conscious knowledge; in the lower forms of human life, it is but the blind feeling of intuition as the soul attempts to translate its moral feelings under the forms of worship.

Thus it is that in the mind of the pagan we have an "idea of God." It is a small starting point, but yet a starting point. How is it to be accounted for? It is not the product of either human knowledge or culture. It must come from without him and we believe its nativity is in God. It is true that the mere 'idea of God' even as interpreted under the low forms of pagan worship may not account for a well organized system of religion, but it does play a very important part in its birth at least. It must be taken into any account which aims to interpret the moral consciousness of the lower forms of human life and no one as yet has given us any account of the existence of this 'idea of God' that surpasses that given by the Christian leadership, which places it in God Himself. Aside from this conclusion no rational explanation has ever been given the 'idea of God' that exists in the mind of the heathen.

(2) We believe in a world composed of many worlds: we call it a universe. This presents to our minds a wonderful variety of phenomena. We see each working in its particular sphere and apparently independent of the other. We are conscious of this wonderful correlation of forces and their unity and harmony. They exhibit order and the touch of an intelligent hand.

Man recognizes here the presence of the same factors, that enter into the production of anything at his hands. He sees that in the making of a machine, intelligence must characterize every move. He argues therefore that this being true, it must likewise be true in the making of a world, or of worlds. If there is an intelligent—in fact must be—personal being behind the production of a sewing machine, there is no other ground upon which you can account for the existence of the universe, except upon the presence of a personal, intelligent being. This being we call God.

If the presence of an invention argues to our mind an inventor, how about the origin of the inventor? Has he come by chance? If the great masterpiece of art that adorns your



walls demands an artist, Did the face of the artist come by chance? If your office chair needed a maker, Did the sun come by chance? If the harp you play had a maker, Why not that most wonderful of all musical instruments, the human voice? Did the rose in your garden come by chance when the wax flower that graces your mantle-piece needed the skillful touch of your hand for its perfection? No; we can not accept these absurdities. If the existence of God is a profound mystery, that of Godlessness is a far greater one.

But is the presence of mystery any argument against His reality? We ask, Is it any argument against the reality of your own being, if we find mystery in it—and no one will deny its presence there? Who has yet fathomed the mystery of the five senses—seeing, hearing, etc.? Who is it that is able to fathom the depths of the truth of assimilation? Has any one given us a rational answer to the wrinkle on the aged face? The presence of disease and death are loud witnesses to our utter failure, and show that we have not reached a point beyond that where we know only the processes and forms of physical life. Life itself still escapes us. How does the object which I call a book, come into my eye and then into my consciousness? How does the music become a part of my experience? At what point does the food I ate for dinner become a part of my body—such as nerve, blood, bone, etc.? How is it that the bread I ate for supper becomes a part of my brain, the very organ by which I try to discover the very mystery of bread and brain? How does it come that the mind is able to think upon itself? What is the relation between the mind and the body? Let us be consistent and face the facts. These are the unsolved problems and the unanswered questions of centuries; they are the profound mysteries of human life. Every flower that casts its fragrance to the winds; every leaf that quivers in the evening breeze; every blade of grass that carpets the earth with its green, gives ample testimony to the presence of mystery in nature. With mystery then, both within man and without him, How can he

consistently call in question the existence of God? If the creation presented to our minds possesses facts which evade complete knowledge, how much more must the creator be clothed in a form that evades us.

But then mystery has its value. Eliminate it from the order of things and what would be the fundamental position of man? Moral power and greatness must in the very nature of the case be mysterious. Otherwise it would be useless for man. A religion with the element of mystery eliminated would have no moral value for him, and man would in spite of himself go on to the task of making one that possessed this element. If man was other than what he is, the reverse might probably be true. It never can be however, so long as he remains in his present form of being.

It is evident then that both from the physical and moral order of the universe; both from the consciousness that orders the world of physical life and from that which prevails in the mind of man, we have, in no small manner, evidence for the existence of a being that we call God. We realize the humanness of any effort to fully account for His existence, for there is no one argument that can completely account for Him, which is to the advantage rather than the disadvantage of man, as we shall presently see.

### WHAT IS HE?

This inquiry suggests a study of His nature. Let us say in the first place that He is not a big man. This is the idea not only of the child and particularly of the heathen, but of many who have more mature and intelligent heads upon their shoulders. We appreciate the difficulty for man to conceive of God under other than human forms. He has a body, and hence feels that his God must likewise have one. The Bible speaks of His hands, His feet, His eyes, His ears, etc., and man finds it difficult to conceive of God in other forms than those in which he conceives himself. The only type of a person with which he has had anything to do, is that under

the form of flesh and blood, and it is not surprising to find him in the early stages of life, either moral or physical, to think of God as a large physical form.

The statement of the church is that He is a 'person' separate and unique in His nature from man. This is true, (1st) from a study of man himself. If personality in man is the highest element, it must likewise be in his Maker. This sets God in a sphere quite His own. However when we state that God is a 'person,' we do not say that He is an 'individual,' because the fundamental basis of man's individuality is his physical body, and this does not characterize the being of God. We must be careful to note this distinction, for otherwise our God will be no better than that which exists for the heathen. Individuality as we have considered it, limits its owner. This can not apply absolutely to God, but to man only. Thus we say that God does not possess a body—at least not a physical one. It is true that when He became incarnate in human flesh, he limited Himself to its conditions and to this extent became an individual; this was not of necessity, but an act of His own free choice.

Then again, man's sense of responsibility is ample proof of the personal character of his God. In the face of nature man has no pangs of conscience. He has no fear or remorse for his acts before the beast, the tree or the flower. He does not need to be told that he can not sin against the impersonal thing—even though it be in the form of a God—and hence before such is not responsible. Worship, with its offerings and sacrifices, is not founded on nature—or the impersonal—but on the ideal of personality.

The pagan uses nature as a basis, only because he feels that the being which he calls his God, knows, chooses, hates, etc., under her many forms. He worships the tree, not because he identifies the tree with his god, but rather because he feels that his god has taken up his residence within the tree. Even though he limits his god to the many forms of



nature—and in this manner has many gods,—this does not destroy their personal character for him.

Thus he offers sacrifice to appease their anger and to win their good favor. The fact that he is unable to name his god under the personal form—which is Jesus Christ—of the Christian faith is no argument against his conception of either a god or his personal character. This comes only when he grasps the unity of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. This unity he lost in his Fall from the true God.

But our greatest evidence for the personality of God is the Bible itself. It everywhere recognizes Him under this form. It states that “in the beginning God **created** the heavens and the earth;” God said, “Let there be light,” “I am the Lord thy God.” Can any other than personality, **create**, or **speak**? Is the first personal pronoun ‘I’ ever used of the impersonal? Then again: If God is not personal, what significance would John 13:3:17, Matthew 16:17, Galatians 4:4 have? They would not only be silly, but the words of the lunatic, a travesty upon truth and an insult to man.

The denial of the personality of God is the first step to the denial of sin. Eddyism hence to justify its denial of the reality of the latter, rejects the doctrine of the personal character of God. It is a blow at the authority of God over human life and the enthronement of unbridled license in its stead. The form which God as a divine and holy personality assumes is likewise very evident from a survey of the Scriptures. He is a **Trinity** in **Unity**. This is, that in some manner—and we must remember that the fact is always greater than the theory of the fact—this nature which we call God exists as Father, Son and Holy Spirit: not three gods, but three persons partaking of one common nature which we call God. (Matthew 28:19). This is a profound mystery. (Collossians 2:2). “God in a Spirit uncreated and perfect,” is the simple language by which the Christian church has for centuries known Him.

While it is true that we are not able to comprehend Him, we can however apprehend Him. That is, we can not know Him

in whole, but we can know Him in part. We can know Him not on all sides of His nature, but we can know Him on some sides. This is to our great advantage, strange as it may seem. If His ways were not past finding out, the dilemma of human life would be greater and its path darker than at present.

That which I can comprehend—or know entirely—is not my master but my servant. It can not therefore be my helper or give assurance to my hopes. It will on the other hand be a burden and a care. To solve the problem in mathematics, is to be its master and hence greater than it. To know God entirely would be, to be His superior and the human soul has no use for such a God. The God which I can master with my mind, can not be the kind of a being that my needs demand. If the natural man could displace faith with what he calls pure and absolute knowledge, he would not only dethrone God, but annihilate himself. All progress is dependent upon man's inability to fully know truth as that is resident in the being of God. Otherwise man would be his own god, and what a god it would be.

Man is not ignorant of God, even though he be ignorant of the Bible. The heathen realizes his own god after his own image, which accounts for its imperfect character. More or less we all do the same thing—as we shall learn later. To project our own limited and imperfect personality is to find a limited and imperfect god. Our idea of the true God depends very largely therefore upon the type of our medium through which we attempt to realize Him. Our present idea of Him is the result of reading Him, not through our own personality, but through the perfect one of His Son, Christ Jesus. If our conception of God is not satisfactory it is because we have been attempting to realize Him at the wrong point, and from the wrong source.

Again we should know him through the forms created and revealed in Jesus Christ. By this we mean His attributes. That is we can know Him by his attitudes toward us, as these

were disclosed in the person of Jesus Christ. In this manner we can come very close to Him, who is love, mercy, justice, holy, eternal, etc. This is the most rational manner in which to know God. In fact it is about the only way in which we know anything. We know the things of nature only by their marks of shape, color, etc.

This law holds true not only in the field of botany, but likewise in that of astronomy and in the laboratory. The law by which we come to know the realities of the spiritual world are just as reasonable and consistent as those by which we come to know those of the material world. The marks under which we know God are not ideal but real. They have been tested by the consciousness and experience of millions of people who have drawn their warrant from the pages of Holy Writ.

It is then from the world of the Word that we must proceed out into the world of Works, manifest on every hand, in search of the great Worker. If we are to apprehend Him correctly, as He discloses Himself in the works of nature—and preeminently in man—it can only be when once we have sat at the feet of the great teacher, who was God manifest in the flesh. The human heart can not be satisfied with a god who is simply immanent in nature; He must be likewise transcendent. If He is in nature: He must likewise be above nature, to be of any value for man. He will not be satisfied with a god who is less than the one portrayed on the pages of the Bible, and he is here indicated on every page after this manner.

A being holy and righteous altogether, hating sin and finding no favor with evil, yet a being of infinite love and of tender mercy, loving the sinner and wooing the evil doer with a tenderness and a constancy greater than a father or a mother: this is the God for man; it is the God of the Bible. He is the native atmosphere for the soul and no peace can come to man save as he finds it in His presence.

## CONCLUSION.

1. God exists as personal and triune.
2. We can know Him, in part only.
3. His highest expression is that of Love.
4. The Bible is the source of our greatest Knowledge of Him.

### STUDY III.

## THE DOCTRINE OF MAN: THE STATE OF INNOCENCE.

Genesis 2:7—"And the Lord God formed Man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

The God whom we have described on a former page is not one given over to idleness. He is a being of industry and of action. The qualities which best describe Him—as love, holiness, creator, etc., are indicative of this. He therefore is not without witness in the earth. Many voices clamor to do Him honor, the greatest of which is Man.

He is just such a creature as we would expect God to create; one in perfect consistency with what we have conceived Him to be. We find man to be a fine compliment to the nature of our God.

He is not only the reflector of the highest moral interests of God, but the center of every human activity. The whole economy of God, both moral and physical has been in his behalf. To know Him then, is not only highly important but absolutely essential. Man's view of himself colors and determines the scope and value of his entire outlook upon the whole of reality. Not only are his impressions governed by a knowledge of his history and nature, but his expressions as well receive the finish that gives them real worth for him. "Know thyself" expresses a necessity and a truth deeper than many of us apprehend. To know him, is to know him past, present and future. It is to see him in relation not only to a few material facts, but preeminently in relation to the facts which account for his origin, being and preservation in the world. For man to know himself, is for him to know not only his true place in the world of the material but to note his station amid the great variety of God's moral handiwork as well.

## HIS ORIGIN.

Is he the product of natural or of supernatural Law? Is he here as a result of the forces of nature as we observe them acting in the world about us? Or is he to be accounted for on other grounds? If the being of man argues in behalf of the existence of a personal God, it is likewise true that the existence of God argues in behalf of the origin of man. It will show conclusively that he is from other sources than the purely material ones. We therefore say that man is the product of the highest creative act of an absolute, personal being who is God. The fact is he **must** be. For the effect must be consistent with the cause and the cause must be adequate to the effect. Otherwise we would have disorder everywhere. Rational personalities cannot be accounted for on the ground of irrational physical forces.

That the impersonal results are not the product of impersonal causes is evident in every department of human activity. Then why in the divine? If man is essentially a free moral personality—and no one but an atheist, and then he with reservation will deny this fact—no other conclusion can be reached, relative to his beginning in time. Our day has seen that instead of man being a subject for the laboratory, he is a moral creature essentially, and a subject rather therefore, of divine revelation. We have come to see that his creation depends not upon the nicety of a sentence or of the logic of a proposition, but upon the truth of this divine revelation. The character then of man does not depend upon the findings of the physicist, neither is his value to be estimated and established by science, as understood, unaided. This we understand only where we note his relation to his moral source.

To determine this source we must fall back upon the account outlined in the opening chapters of the first book of the Bible. Here we discover that with a simplicity that has baffled the wisest of earth's sons, the writer assures us that man comes from a different source than that at-



tributed to him in the physical process. He states that man was made in the image of God. (Genesis 1:26) No theory that even accepts 'evolution' as either a 'method' or a 'form' for the creative activity is a safe one to follow. Even in the hands of God for the production of such a creature as man, is it consistent with either the true meaning of the term, or the expressed intent of the spirit that pervades the sacred history that records this truth.

### HOW DID GOD CREATE MAN?

How beautiful, because so simple, are the words of the sacred writer on this point: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul." There is none of the smack of the naturalist to it. It has the odor not of the laboratory, but of the sanctuary. To attempt to improve upon this account is mere presumption, and will end in dismal failure. False science as well as philosophy has not added one ray of light to its mystery, but on the other hand has befogged its meaning, and made its message speak in a foreign tongue. This statement of Scripture announces two great facts: (1) Man's body was made from the dust of the ground. The Hebrew word for 'dust' signifies not dust of the most ordinary kind, but dust of a very fine quality. It was a quality of dust prepared by God out of which man was to be made and not such as is usually conceived. But this is not man: it is simply the house in which he lives. The Bible states that it is the "temple for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit." It is very consistent, then, to think of God selecting the very finest material from which to build the body of man. Man's body is the physical organism that puts him in touch with the physical world in which he lives; it is the medium of communication, between him as a creature of spirit and the world of sense. It is the material means by which the spirit—or immaterial man within,—holds communication with the material world without. If man is to have a perfect communion with

life about him, he must have a channel for that communion and this is afforded in his body.

(2) Man has a soul. It would perhaps be within the whole truth to say that man **is a soul**, for that is what he is fundamentally. He is essentially a spirit and that a moral one. This expresses him at the highest point of his being and marks his true value. He is the peer in creation because he first embodies its glory. The presence of this quality, nay of this nature, is traced to that of Him who is his creator. Man was made in His image, and according to His likeness. This image consists of the following qualities: knowledge, righteousness, freedom, holiness, etc., and through which man became an heir to immortality. Thus man is not simply to come into immortality in some distant day: he is immortal now. The future will determine only the **form** and **character** of that immortality, but not the **Fact**.

Man was created in righteousness and holiness. This quality however, was not something added after his creation, but coincident with it. It was not a patch added to his nature—as the Roman Catholic church teaches—but was born along with man. It is a part then of his very being. Man however was not created perfectly holy, but he was created innocent. His holiness was only potentially perfect: that is, he possessed the possibilities of perfect moral life. This we see evidenced in the life of the child: it is not perfect in its moral life, but it is innocent.

### WHY DID GOD CREATE MAN?

Man is here not by mere chance. Neither is he the product of God simply as a mere display of power. His creation must be consistent with the nature of the Creator. The reasons for his being in the world must lie within the very nature of God Himself. This nature we saw to be expressed at its highest in terms of Love.

The Bible states that “God is Love.” It is here, then, that we find the answer to our question. Love unexpressed is to us



unthinkable. If love is to see and realize its highest, it can do no better than choose a medium consistent with its nature, through which to realize itself, and by which it can come into its own. Personal love then, creates a personal channel through which to communicate its wealth, and by which its true character can be reflected. Thus man stands in a representative capacity to God.

By this we do not mean to state that man is to be accounted for on the ground of a necessity within the nature of God; but rather upon the free working out of love through the avenue of a free personality. It was love operating along the true lines of its nature. It was a larger motive than a mere necessity that actuated God in the creating of man. It was that outlook upon love's possibilities that moved Him to create a being who could not only receive His greatest bestowals but one who could return them likewise.

### CONCLUSION.

1. Man was made in the image of God.
2. Man is a free moral personality.
3. Man is immortal and a creature of divine love.

## STUDY IV.

# THE DOCTRINE OF MAN: THE STATE OF SIN.

Romans 3:23—"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

Man thus created was placed in a most beautiful garden. He was to have dominion over the new Creation. His environment was such as not only to preserve him in peace with his maker but to afford him the satisfaction of his every desire. In a most prodigal manner God had surrounded him with everything that he needed to make him happy. Of the fruit of every tree of the garden he could eat—with but one exception.

Scarcely had he time to drink in the beauty and meaning of his surroundings however than he is the center of an awful calamity. Upon his entry into the garden, God not only counseled him not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil, but as well declared the result of such eating: it was to be death. And by whatsoever names we may call it and under whatsoever forms we may conceive it, this awful failure of man has perpetuated itself down through history, and by this fact the man of 2000 years A. D. will be linked to the one of 4000 B. C. Its presence is recognized everywhere. Society and government are forced to consider it and religion is but the story of man's heroic attempt to surmount the awful results that attended this calamity. Its moral wreckage is evident everywhere.

## WHAT IS IT?

In what does it consist? What is its meaning for both God and man? Man was created within a moral economy and to this economy stands eternally related. But he was likewise created free: i. e. he had the power of free choice. It was

his prerogative either to live within the bounds of its influence or to be without.

Howsoever much the author of his being might desire that he live within this ideal state, nevertheless it cannot be forced upon him. In this respect he is master of his destiny. To live within the circle of this order was to enjoy the personal fellowship of God and hence live in peace and harmony: to be without was to be alienated and away from God—a child outside his father's house. Man by a free act of his own chose to step outside this circle of perfect environment, and hence chose for himself a new type of environment. God now was no longer his companion, no longer the light of his life. Consequently the interests of God—which were to be mutual—were no longer of supreme import to him, but were displaced by others which were alien to his maker's highest plan. Man in the very nature of the case became estranged from his God, and all the possibilities of this estrangement began to realize themselves in his history.

But the sad fact of man's fall is not simply that he fell away from God—which was certainly bad enough—but that he should do so as the victim of deception. That he should adopt a course that promised him not only autonomy within the circle in which he had been born, but equality as well, is the pathos of the awful tragedy. For history is replete in testimony that certainly is an impeachment of the motives of that action.

Man's fall however incurred greater things than simply to make him a mere passive unit outside the bounds of perfect communion. Once outside this sphere of personal touch with his maker, man began to distrust Him. He became active in carrying to an issue the interests that were of highest concern to him now and which were to bring him power when realized. He was hoping to become himself the head of an order that would rival all others. The words of the tempter 'Ye shall be as gods' sounded sweet to him and when once heeded the whole moral tenor of his life was henceforth to be changed.

The offer of occupying a place of equality with his maker; the vision of being his equal, these were soon to crystalize into an act which would change the whole moral outlook of a race. He thus not only departed from God, but established himself upon a plain of moral supremacy.

But unfortunately for man, this was a mere bubble which soon was to vanish before the white heat of truth.

### WHERE SIN WAS DESTINED TO LEAD MAN.

Once the master of things, man soon discovered that the logic of his act was permanent abandonment of God. To defy self is the choosing of another God and the end of this is to be outside the presence of the true God. Man became the agent of an economy that aimed not only at the overthrow of man, but of God as well. The real significance of this act of man is not only that it is to incapacitate him for meeting the highest claims of his own being but it strikes a blow at the very foundation of life in God. It anticipated not only the defeat of His plans but the displacement of Him as the moral ruler of the world. This is the task that confronted man, and as party to the plan it was the vision of its aims. In his attempt to be 'God' man abandoned the initial purpose of his life and was in a sense his own god.

In departing from God, man thus became unlike Him. Made at first in the divine image, he awoke to find that resemblance disturbed and changed. The bond of true union is broken and the mark of perfect cooperation impossible. He is no longer able to cooperate with his maker because he is not like Him. "It is a great principle that recognizes that a man is always like his God." It is in fact a great law of human life, that a man becomes like that which he worships. Man in the Fall shifted his worship from righteousness to sin and thus his future was likewise changed from life to death. Therefore when man departed from God and patterned his god after himself, that is the idea that now governs him and hence all the forces of decay and disease are set to work. The

awful vision that greets man is that with his abandonment of God, he also abandoned that which united them: His true spiritual nature. Man's love now has a new objective, which serves the only tie between him and his God. While man is able to grasp his possibilities, he is yet unable to realize or fulfill them.

Man is now to have not a personal acquaintance with God, but a mere intellectual groping after Him. Man's God henceforth is to be false because it is founded upon a false humanity. The pattern of his moral life is gone and deterioration is an inevitable result. But with the going of a perfect knowledge of God, likewise goes the perfect knowledge of himself. A lost vision of God implies a lost vision of man. "Man then is a ruined instrument: a harp with a broken string; a star eclipsed in the heavens; a sun robbed of its light." Paul states that he is a creature, "dead in trespasses and in sins."

Man is likewise ignorant of God through the Fall. The creation of man implies a capacity of knowing God. Love is the medium of a perfect knowledge of God. To know God therefore is to love. And to know love is to love. But upon the entry of sin through the free exercise of man's will, the avenues of perfect knowledge were obstructed. Thus man has a distorted view of God. "The perfect activity of the will of man is conditioned upon his perfect obedience to the will of God." The genius therefore of the first sin, is that it is a doubt of divine love. It is an impeachment of the motives that constituted man a free creature. Man has been robbed of his intelligence. Where once he knew God as a son, he now knows Him as an alien. Once he realized in him a father; now a master wielding a law that is relentless and inexorable, eternally opposed to the new element of his life. This is the picture of man; a creature shorn of his beauty and power; an object of eternal pity; the subject of divine love and compassion.

## CONCLUSION.

1. Man's sin consisted in freely acting in opposition to the will of God.

2. This resulted in his ignorance of and unlikeness to God and his unfitness to carry out the ends of his creation.



## STUDY V.

# THE DOCTRINE OF MAN: THE STATE OF GRACE.

I. Peter 2:9—"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."

Seeing that the consequences of man's act of departure from God entailed such disastrous results, it is evident, that left to himself, there is not the shadow of a possibility that he can regain his lost estate and place in the plain of God through any effort or merit of his own. This is in view of what man became in sin. That which has supreme value with God is the moral, and human effort wins His pleasure only as it represents moral worth in the doer of the deed. The work is always the revelation of the character of the worker and since man had become unable through his fall into sin to do anything that was good, if he is to be reinstated in the good favor of God, some one from the outside must intervene in his behalf. If sin disqualifies him from within, righteousness from without must qualify him for his reinstatement with God. The plan of salvation then is fitted to the darkened nature of man and was designed in view of his inability to meet the moral requirements necessary for perfect fellowship with his Maker.

But while man in sin, had taken a plunge into the dark, he was not always to remain there. He is not a creature made for the dark. It is beyond our power to conceive of the creature described on a former page, as being left desolate and alone by his God. What has been a matter of almost intuition with man, as evidenced in the universal practice of sacrifice, has been verified by the record of revelation. God has made provision for man's moral needs and his speedy return to the fold of His Father. It anticipates his complete recovery from sin, the victory over the condition of heart that

imprisons him away from God, and his return to the state of divine grace.

There however, prevails no small amount of vagueness as to the real significance attached to the "state of grace," for to many the intent of 'grace' is a closed book. The question, then, is, What is implied in the word 'grace'? Is it a condition or a relation or is it an attitude? It is all of these, and yet not any one of them alone. Divine grace is "the loving favor of God bestowed upon sinners through faith in Jesus Christ." It is an attitude of God then on the basis of what both He and Jesus Christ are, conditioned by a personal acceptance on the part of the individual.

To say then that man is brought into a state of grace is to say that he is now within the circle of God's favor, which favor becomes for him, the active principle of his salvation upon his appropriation by faith, of the merits of the God-man. This means that God looks upon the sinner with pleasure now, not because of any merit of either thought or work of his own, but because he has accepted and is willing that Jesus Christ shall be his substitute in righteousness and moral perfection before God. The moral character of God demands a perfect being, and man realizing this accepts Christ as his substitute to appear as his advocate before the bar of moral justice.

### THE AUTHOR OF SALVATION.

With such a conception then of both the moral condition of man in sin and the design in the life of Jesus Christ, the most natural question is, Who is responsible for this wonderful plan for man's restoration to God? From the picture of man presented to us on every page of the Bible, it is evident if he is ever brought back into normal relations with his maker, it must come from without him. If his attitude towards his Creator is to be changed at all so that he can realize the ends for which he was brought into the world, it must be that He who has been sinned against must take up the broken threads



and unite them again. For he who is able to recognize that he has been wronged is likewise able to appreciate somewhat the character of the wrong, and the moral distance which it has placed between the doer of the wrong and the wronged. This is especially true of God, who looks upon sin with the same infinite character of knowledge and wisdom, that He does upon the good and righteous.

Man unlike and distanced from God; man with the highest capacities of his life directed not in behalf of, but in opposition to the highest interests of God, is certainly not qualified to take the initial step towards his return to Him. Morally man is devoid of power to initiate any action looking toward his delivery from sin. The help must come from one who knows not only the strength of sin, but the weakness of man as well. No one is so qualified except God, the creator of man.

But will He, against whom sin and sinner are arraigned take the first step toward Man's salvation? Is it to be supposed that He who has been wronged,—and in a manner without the grasp of the human mind—will go out after man in his lost state? It is not difficult to anticipate the answer of the natural man on this point.

The Bible however, everywhere proceeds upon the assumption that God first went out after man and not the reverse. It was God who first pierced the veil of darkness and gloom that had settled over man; it was infinite love reaching her hand down through the mists of despair to man, that he might again be lifted to his former height of power and dominion. Man was creating gods many, fashioned after the image of his own person, blurred and marred by sin, and in so doing was getting farther away from the true God. It was God who in Christ came to earth to present man with a new conception of his nature and to displace the imperfect with the perfect. He was the designer of the plan that when realized will make possible man's restoration. But for Him the history of man would tell quite another story, and his outlook upon the future would be prophetic of other things. The fact of the matter is

that the Incarnation is the most rational thing to expect, considering what both God and man are.

Scarcely had man yielded to the tempter when God uttered a promise to the woman; later He entered into a covenant with Abraham; farther He gives promises to Moses; and His promises disclosed in prophecy are conclusive evidence that not man, but God conceived and carried into execution the way of man's return, both to Him and to the true ends of his being.

#### WHEN WAS REDEMPTION DETERMINED FOR MAN?

Was it in time? Was it only after God beheld the awful catastrophe resulting from sin, that He was moved to mercy in man's behalf? Was it only after some pressure from without, that he was moved to intercede in man's behalf? No; God determined to save man in eternity. Before the creation of either man or the world, divine love saw the result of man's first exercise of his power of choice, and made ready a remedy. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, tells us that "Christ is the lamb, slain from the foundation of the world." In other words coincident with the plan for Man's creation, there was also the plan for his redemption. God in His infinite wisdom saw that the creature whom He was to bring into the world would exercise his highest prerogative—that of free choice—not in the direction of the highest, but in that of the lowest, of ends.

That man was going to sin, was known long before his creation. This did not change His plan relative to the character of the creature He would create. For if He is to make a man, and not a machine; if the creature of His love was to be a reflection of His own nature—or if he was to make a being in His own image—he must possess that capacity, which if mis-directed would inevitably lead him away from the true ends for which he would be created. If God is to make such a creature as planned, He could not make one in which there would not be the possibility of going counter to the highest

plan of his nature. For had God made a creature constituted otherwise He would have made one unlike Himself, which would have been none at all. If man reflects the nature of his Creator—and this the Bible teaches—then we must say that the only creature consistent with that nature, is just such a being as we find in man. Taking just the limited knowledge of man at our command, we can say beyond question that if God—such as we find imperfectly reflected in man—is the creator of man, He must likewise be his redeemer, since He is not only in touch with him through a personal acquaintance with him, but identified with him in no small manner.

There are then, points in common of the most fundamental importance between God and man, which make the authorship of salvation, to originate with God beyond all question.

The cross then is a reality in the plan of God long before its revelation to either the world or man in time. He who is infinite in love is also infinite in wisdom, and out of this He saw not only man created and environed with the highest good, but likewise saw him yielding to that which brought him into ruin. The plan of salvation then is not confined to the history of man. Its nativity is to be found in the history of God which is the story of eternity. The call of man ruined, was heard by love eternal and this call was answered by the gift in Jesus Christ, who through pain and suffering, represented man, making possible his entry into divine favor, and to the realization of the ends of his being, which were the ends of divine love.

### CONCLUSION.

1. That man is unable to effect his own salvation.
2. That God must in the very nature of the case, have been the author of Salvation.
3. That the plan for man's redemption was coincident with that of his creation.

## STUDY VI.

### THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST: HIS PERSON.

John 1:14.—“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.”

In the study of Jesus Christ as the author of salvation, we are treading upon Holy ground. We are to contemplate the profoundest mystery of God's dealings with man. It is the mystery of love and love is always a mystery. The mystery of the incarnation is the mystery of divine love giving heed to the call of despairing love in man; it is a still greater one when we contemplate the precise form which He assumed in heeding the call. Jesus Christ as God made flesh, dwelling in time and among men: this is the thought that staggers the mind and overthrows reason when left to itself.

#### WHAT HE IS.

This has been not only for near 2000 years the perennial question for man, but will be till the end of time. That “We are learning but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,” has special pertinence at this point. For man it is the burning question of life. Where the head has wavered under the weight of its moral import, the heart has gone forth and bulwarked itself with hope and conviction. His witnesses are to be found in every clime and under every flag. Man has given Him testimony, not only in the sacrifice of gold, but of life. His witness has been sealed, not by poverty and hardship alone, but by blood. The church of the 20th century is the gift of his devotion and the civilization of 2000 years the fruit of his faith in Him whom he has worshiped as God.

#### His Names.

With God a name signifies and characterizes its bearer above everything; it stands for quality in character. It represents

an inner permanent value and not an outer fleeting fancy. The names by which He is known therefore, in the flesh are no empty and meaningless shells: they stand for positive marks of worth and value:—Jesus Christ. “And thou shalt call His name Jesus: for He shall save His people from their sins.” Matthew 1:21.

(1) **Jesus.** It means savior. It carries with it the ideal of redeemerhood. It not only portrays a relation of God with man, but the power of sealing this relation as well. In the person of Jesus, God has come into a new and peculiar relationship with humanity. It means that in His person, God dwells and holds communion with a fallen race. This is the bond that unites Him, unique and distinct, with a race realizing ends abnormal and inconsistent with those of its creation.

(2) **Christ.** It means the anointed one. The one set apart; the Messiah. Through this name He is identified with Him who comes to fulfill the promises of the past, by the accomplishment of the divine purpose toward men. It marks the man Jesus not simply as He who is to accomplish the will of God in behalf of a ruined creature, but that it will be done by obedience to that will.

These names signify that in realizing their truth, a three-fold function is disclosed: (1) Prophet, (2 Timothy 3:15:17); (2) Priest, (Hebrews 7:25:28); (3) King, (Acts 2:25:38). As prophet He is the great teacher—and this was ever the great function of the prophet. As Priest: He not only offered the sacrifice but was that sacrifice. As King: He rules over us in the kingdom of grace.

### His Natures.

These are two: Human and Divine.

(1) **Human.** He was true man; possessed a human soul and body and was subject to the human wants, as hunger, thirst and fatigue. He had a human mother, being born of the Virgin Mary. This being born by Jesus is known as the



“Incarnation.” He grew to manhood and played the part of a real human individual.

One element however distinguishes Him as unique; He was without sin. He prayed, “Father forgive **them** not **me**”: He said “Ye must be born again”: but not **himself**. He went into the temple, but not to offer sacrifice. His human nature was the ideal and normal one. This factor places Him above man in the field of morality and moral possibility, and was the lacking element in human life and the requisite to man’s final recovery of his lost dominion.

(2) **Divine**. He is not only man but also God. This we discover in the names attributed to Him (John 1:2;14); in the qualities or attributes ascribed to Him (John 1:15;8:57-58); in the quality of His works (John 1:3); in the worship enjoined for Him, (Philippians 2:8;11) in the Bible. If His manhood was true, His divinity was equally real and true. (Romans 9:5; John 5:23). The term ‘divinity’ must not be confused with that same quality which was ascribed to the heathen gods of past times. This quality ascribed to Christ is based on the fact that He was first Deity: i. e. That he was not simply a God-endowed man, but God essentially.

He is not simply a great man. He is the great God. Keep this distinction well in mind. Do not let it go. In the Incarnation, the eternal Word, did not lay aside the essential facts of His deity. He only changed the form of their manifestation. He is not so much God and man as He is God in, though, and as man. He was accommodating Himself to the plain of man’s apprehension. Otherwise Christ degenerates into a mere teacher of His age—of which there were many—whose message has only local value at its best. If He is not God manifest in the flesh—the Immanuel of prophecy—but only God indwelling in a man; if He is not “the way,” but only the ‘way shower,’ then He is not and cannot be the savior from sin and not in any sense the promised redeemer foretold and expected.



He is the God-Man. As such He is the gateway between God and man. In Him, humanity finds its way back to God, and in Him God finds His way back to man. He is the meeting place for both man and God. He is man's perfect God because He is perfect divinity for man: He is God's perfect man because He is the ideal humanity. In other words instead of man attempting to find His God on the plain of his own imperfect moral personality, he now finds Him through the perfect one of Jesus Christ. Instead of God reckoning with man on the plain of his ruined humanity, He now has another basis: that of the God-man. Thus he is not only the crown of humanity for God, but He is the illumination of the divine life of God for man.

He differs then from man, not in degree but in kind. He is not the image of a good man—just a little better than man—but that of God Himself. To see Him is to see God. His distance from man is not to be measured therefore by the human standards of fallen man, but by the moral standards consistent with His own being.

It is from such a conception of Christ that man has come through these years to love God. While misconception of God has bred hatred for Him in man, however to behold in Jesus the true God, is to change all the currents of His life from the direction of hatred to that of love. This however now adds to his responsibility, for it is one thing to hate God of whom man is ignorant; it is another thing to do so in the face of knowledge of Him.

The form assumed by God in coming to the earth was necessitated by the character of the task to be performed. He identified Himself with human nature and this afforded the medium for His saviorhood. He must assume the plan of humanity if He would realize his plan for salvation. The elements lacking in man to effect his own union with God, were supplied in Christ's nature. If man was unlike God in point of moral quality; if he was ignorant of Him as respects his mind; if he was helpless as respects his power of obedience, it

is in Christ that man finds all these abiding in wonderful perfection. This is the view of scripture since on the one hand it conceives Him as existing on an equality with God, (Philippians 2:6 “Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God”) while on the other it recognizes Him as a servant (Philippians 2:7, “And took upon Himself the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man”) who came to minister but not to be ministered unto. (Matthew 20:28, “Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister”).

It is a singular fact that within the entire history of man, God was bringing the race back to Him through one man: viz. Abraham, Moses, etc. But in the fullness of time, He sends the perfect Man, to effect a condition of moral return to Him in the person of His Son. It is in Him, in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, that we are to find our real self, “for we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.”

That we have in the person of Jesus Christ one who was in all points human—even being tempted as we—, but in all essentials divine, is the testimony not of sight but of faith. Man must accept His revelation, both from the Bible and as it has operated in the near 2000 years of its history, vindicating itself at every point, although he may not be able to fathom the depths of its mystery. It is the infinite effectual disclosure of divine love and to reveal love is to reveal holiness, the mystery of which the Apostle Paul tells us is great. The mystery of the God-man is the mystery therefore of love. As such He has been the height of the moral ideal of the world: He is the moral basis that has supported a civilization unprecedented in the annals of man. He is not only the light that lighteneth every man coming into the world, but the source of his power and progress while in the world.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. Under the name Jesus Christ He occupies a threefold office (1) Prophet, (2) Priest, (3) King.

2. That He is a divine-human person, known better as the God-man.

3. That the union of the two natures is perfect and complete.

## STUDY VII.

### THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST: HIS LIFE.

I. Cor. 15:57.—“But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Any attempt to translate the elements that constitute a truly great man by the use of words, phrases and sentences must be characterized by a most signal failure. The facts that afford the back ground of such a life may be visible, but the power that enables us to grasp them is not so; it evades every attempt to prescribe it. It evades every attempt of man to confine it to his few mechanical forms, and mocks him as he fails.

This is most applicable when we are called to estimate and study the God-man. His life as well as the life of any other individual is not to be estimated by a study of a few external facts. Its character is accounted for upon entirely different grounds. In fact the advent of Jesus Christ, saw the advent of a new language. It was the language not of the tongue but of the heart. It was the task of this language to translate the hidden feelings, hopes, faith, etc., of His heart into the gospel of the heart of man. But the person of Christ is the power of that gospel. It is that gospel, and to know it is to know Him. To grasp its relation to the soul and its significance for the being of man is to know therefore the place of the Christ, and to be able to estimate Him correctly.

### HIS STATE OF HUMILIATION.

He was in the form of a servant. This is a trite phrase, evident on every page of the Bible. That He laid aside His riches, His glory, His joy, to be the man of sorrows, so poor that He said: “the foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests but the Son of Man has not where to lay His head,” Matthew 8:20 is a fact well attested in sacred history. Paul tells us that He ‘emptied’ Himself, and in these few words

states the great mystery of the surrender made by the Word, in assuming human nature.

This we know that He who was co-existent and co-equal with God in assuming the nature of man, became also subject to its conditions. In the Incarnation then the divine Word manifesting Himself under the form of human life willingly assumes the 'form of a servant' in the likeness of men.

The God-man then—as one person but two natures united,—in the state of self-renunciation laid aside the full exercise of His power which He possessed before the Incarnation. The divine nature of Christ, then was limited only as it chose to be. He put aside nothing that was essential to His being, but simply willed to allow the natural properties of the Christ to predominate as He pleased. This was noted in the display of His supernatural power in miracles, in which He showed forth His glory.

Thus when He assumed the physical He became subject—to that extent—to its limitations, which in the end was to mean suffering. This element was prominent throughout His life. In fact so much so that we now identify Him with the one spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, as "the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." (Isaiah 53:3).

He suffered not only the privations of ordinary human comforts: not only the pangs of pain in Pilate's court and on the cross; but much more the sufferings of the mind and heart. It was the suffering of one who knew the awful issue of sin in the life of man, and his utter inability to evade its results, unaided. It was the suffering of one with a superior knowledge, who beheld the calamity which had befallen God's creature bringing the darkest ignorance. The sufferings of the body are one: those of the heart and mind quite another thing. It was the pain of a divine insight into human nature away from God. In short it was the anguish of the God-man. Disowned by His own kin; deserted by His own disciples; openly opposed by the religious leaders of His day; these are the burdens that crushed His heart.

The time from the scene of the temptation in the wilderness, to Pilate's Hall is to be measured not in terms of days, months or even years, but in heart-aches. It is no small distance from the temple room to the cross. It is the road of conflict.

Unable to seize Him in the light, the powers of evil chose the night-time, and reveling in their supposed victory, carry Him off to the cruel cross to die. This is the climax of His sufferings. It is the point where focalize all the powers of sin for their final attempt at destruction. To the natural eye they seem to gain the victory. He is nailed to the cross, and after a period of suffering—not pretended but most real—He dies. It was a real death; it was neither a pretention nor a mere swoon, but in perfect harmony with His plan foretold. (John 19:33:34). This fact is not only borne out in all history but running throughout the Bible from Genesis to Revelation there is the scarlet thread of His blood shed at the time of His death.

He was buried publicly in Joseph's tomb, guarded by a huge stone upon which was the seal of the Roman Emperor. He was not simply hid away in a secluded spot by his disciples, as some assert. Here He was to lie till the Resurrection Morn.

### HIS STATE OF EXALTATION.

It is one thing to follow the Christ as He walks before the eyes of men; it is quite another to accompany Him into that silent country of the dead. In the Apostles' Creed we read that "He descended into hell." To many this has been an unpleasant thought. In fact to some it is revolting and they have refused to utter these words in public. But we are sure this attitude is either due to ignorance or to prejudice, and when once we note its basis and import, none will maintain this attitude. In I. Peter 3:19, we read, "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." That it was the realm of the lost to which He went, is signified by the word 'prison.' Its use also carries with it the mark of finality. There is no parole from this prison, neither does it have doors.



It is a prison, fashioned not after civil, but after moral law. Thus it can't refer to the pious dead in any sense of things.

(2) The word 'preached' also is significant. The word used is not that for the proclamation of good news, but that for the announcement of judgment and authority. It is not the message of salvation for the inhabitants of 'the prison' but of victory and triumph for the Christ.

Then again: no act of the Christ so beautifully and so forcefully interprets Him. It is just such an act as we would suppose him to be capable of doing. Anything less than this would be for us inconsistent with what we know Him to be. The thought is not simply that He 'descended into hell' but that He could go there and come out again. Hell could not hold Him because of His moral quality.

It was the victory of good over evil. Hell can't hold us, when once we appear in the light of His perfection. It is no question on our character to stand in the presence of evil; it is however, when we countenance and engage in the same. Thus it is that we rise in the moral life. It was the triumph of perfection over imperfection, and this is the same law for us to the attainment of divine favor. It is the way for better things for every man. The awful fact of hell is not that we should go there simply, but that we must remain there eternally abandoned from the presence of God, because we lack moral quality to get out.

This is the kind of a Christ your soul needs and His descent into hell, magnifies Him rather than belittles Him. He who can go into hell and come forth crowned with purity and holiness, deserves not censure but praise and worship at your hands. The Creed that brings this act of the Christ to your attention should occupy a large place in your life. For if we are to be conquerors over hell, death, and the grave, in the final issue of our life, it can be only that He who came to redeem us, has first procured this victory for us.

The final approval of this act of victory, is evidenced in

that of the Resurrection. This is the cardinal fact of Christianity. Upon its truth we stand or fall. It is the foundation stone of a true religion, and distinguishes the religion of Jesus Christ from all others. No founder of another religion has passed through this experience. It is the history of Christ alone, and characterizes Him as the only true gospel.

The resurrection fact, is truly a fact and not a mere fancy. It is not the creation of delusion; neither is it the product of fanaticism. That Jesus Christ arose from the dead, is attested not only by the attitude of the early disciples, but upon this experience the church was founded, as well. This organization founded upon this fact has now for near 2000 years withstood the most venomous assaults of evil men, and could not have survived. Still possessing her present power upon any other basis. This fact is and cannot be a mere myth. To assert this as the account for the resurrection, is not only to evade the real truth but to necessitate a bit of mental jugglery, in surmounting the facts built around it, more perplexing.

Its significance for us is beyond computation. We are not able to fully determine its value. We are however assured that it was God's visible approbation of the finished work of the Son. (Romans 8:34). It is upon this basis that the faith of mankind rests. (John 20:28). That humanity looks out into the future with hope and peace, is accounted for by its loyalty to this fact of the victory of the Christ. (I. Cor. 15:19:20).

Neither is man's faith and hope resting simply on a mere mental or so-called spiritual resurrection. It is founded on a physical coming forth of Jesus Christ from the grave. To think of it otherwise is to rob Him of His victory, history of its Christ and the soul of its Savior. For if His resurrection is only a spiritual and not a physical one, what assurance have we that his atonement was real? These facts are linked together and to destroy one is to invalidate for man, the other.

The crown of His life was His ascension into Heaven and marks the last step in His exaltation. It was to His disciples

the assurance of His larger presence with them through His divine Spirit. The Christ humbled as a servant, exalted above all things: He is your Christ and Lord.

### CONCLUSION.

1. That **Christ** assumed two states: That of Humiliation: that of Exaltation.

2. As a servant, He offered Himself up as the “Lamb to take away sin.”

3. As conqueror, He descended into Hell, arose the 3rd day and completed His triumph by ascending to the right hand of the Father.

## STUDY VIII.

### THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST: HIS WORK.

I| John 3:5.—“And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.”

The work must always reveal the worker. The finished product is the measure of the producer. The deed is the child of the thought and ‘as a man thinketh in his heart so is he.’ It stands for a concrete expression of the real qualities that compose the workman. On the other hand it is also true that the work judges the worker. It is the tribunal of his life. Every deed has moral value and before this he either stands or falls; is either vindicated or condemned. In the work then we have a true picture and revelation of the worker. That is, the work is the interpreter of the worker and to know it intelligently is likewise to know him also. It is equally true that the greater the qualities thus revealed in a workman, the greater will be our expectancy; the greater his responsibility.

Not simply by one work either can any man be judged; he must be viewed by the sum total of his life. In the history of the Christ this state was reached in the consummation of His work on the cross. This is His great work; it is the work of his life.

The most rational fact about the whole life of the Savior is that act which qualifies Him for Saviorhood; and that is the atonement. Had His life ended with an act of a lower spiritual significance, His power for the human heart would not have been that of God, but of a mere man. His influence would not have been such as to evoke worship and obedience but simply admiration and respect. In other words the result on the cross, is most consistent with what we have conceived Him to be. For man’s conception of the results of the cross is determined very largely by the form under which he conceives the Christ. If the cross vindicates the claims of the Christ, He

is no less the interpreter of the cross. If He is the personal presence of God in human form, the cross is the only logical conclusion of His life which we could expect. We need not be told that the natural mind is enmity against God since any claim to supernatural character is considered as mere presumption. The work of Christ as affected on the cross, is to be interpreted then as His work as the God-man, and its value for us is the value of redemption.

### THE REASON FOR REDEMPTION.

The great question is always: Why did God become flesh and take the initial step—for this He did beyond doubt—to remedy the ruin of the fall? If His creature whom He had created to be a perfect representative—as we learned in the study of man—deliberately violates the law which made him so, why should He attempt any plan by which he could be reinstated? In other words, what elements are there in God which prompted the plan of reconciliation?

Man was created on a basis of character. It was a character, not in antagonism but in harmony with that of the creator constituted so as to realize this ideal; but now the direction of his life is in another way. He was to mirror the true image of God; now he is revealing that of another. He was created to grow into likeness with God; now his life is unlike that of God. In other words fallen man is a living falsehood. He is man in caricature. Instead of manifesting God as light and love, he now casts a shadow upon His divine purpose. There is now in the divine economy no need for man, and if reason be consulted, his end should be consummated. If God still needs an instrument of illumination He can make another. There is neither in the realm of justice nor of righteousness simply any reason for his redemption. We must go deeper for the answer to our question; it lies within the nature of God Himself. It is that He is 'Love'. (John 3:16).

While it is true that God is not bound to do anything for

man, and hence eliminates any attempt on his part to boast, yet there is a sense in which He must redeem man. If the motive behind the creation of man had been other than divine love, it would have been different with the future of fallen man. It was fortunate that Man's God was other than the being which in sin he conceived Him to be. The words of Paul, "but when the fullness of time was come God sent forth His Son." Galatians 4:4 are not only the explanation of the mystery of divine grace, but also of the fall.

### HOW HE REDEEMED ME.

The task before Him is evident from what we know of man in the state of sin. The problem of divine grace is therefore that of the departure of man from the source of divine life. Hence the Bible speaks of the form assumed by the act of redemption as a "reconciliation" (II. Cor. 5:18:19) the root idea of which is, the restoration of personal relations between parties hitherto estranged. It anticipates an explanation of the human catastrophe, which involved the rebellion of a human will against the claim of the divine Creator.

This act must be conceived as the act of God and is so stated in the Bible. (Acts 20:28, Romans 1:4) (II. Cor. 4:4:6). It is this fact which seals our conviction on the deity of Jesus Christ. It was God in Christ, that was effecting the reconciliation. Thus we know it was not by silver or gold. (I. Peter 1:8); not by the sacrifice of goats and calves (Heb. 9:12); not by any merit or effort offered by man (Ephesians 2:8); but through the precious blood of Christ. (Acts 20:28, Hebrews 12, Ephesians 1:7, Colosians 1:14, Peter 1:19). But blood is life, and in the shedding of His blood He also gave His life a ransom for man. (Matthew 20:28, Galatians 2:20). It was at an infinite price that He has purchased your soul, and on this basis asks your worship and obedience. I. John 1:7, Hebrews 9:22, Cor. 6:20). It was at the cost of suffering that your soul was brought back into favor with God. If this



element was to perfect Him as man's savior it must be also through this that you shall be qualified to stand before the Son of Man.

The sinner justified is now a restored son because the action that has realized this state for him, has been that of the eternal God Himself. It is this fact that allows us not only to state in the language of revelation, that He was our substitute on the cross affecting that which we could not for ourselves, (Galatians 1:4; I. Timothy 2:6, Titus 2:14) but in the words of reason, as well, when we note the place of God in the redemptive act and fact.

Redemption finds its parallel in Creation. (Galatians 6:5, John 1:18). If the morality of the latter was in the fact that 'God saw that it was good' the justice of the former is justified in the act of the sending of His son, who was delivered up for us and our sins.

This plan for divine grace however became effective through obedience. The Father's favor became possible for man through the perfect obedience of His Son. His right to be called the savior of men, depended entirely upon this. Obedience on the part of the first Adam would have kept him within the bounds of that favor: obedience must now regain it for him, through his substitute, the last Adam. Jesus Christ as man's representative: as his substitute, must through obedience secure what he lost by his disobedience. If we can conceive of the departure of man from God in disobedience as being perfect, it is most rational to conclude that now only through a perfect obedience can he be reinstated.

This is the very manner in which scripture views it, and is the method stated on its pages. This law is however, not a new one but the assertion of one as old as man. Upon it not only is man's relation to the moral facts of his being dependent, but those toward society and the state as well. There are no rights to liberty, happiness, etc., outside of obedience. When this quality no longer marks the department of man, his rights cease and he becomes a subject for discipline. Not

only does his place in their favor depend upon this quality but his place in the divine favor as well. You can see the analogy therefore between the relation man sustains to the state and society, and that which marks his place, in the plan of God.

The place of Christ in the plan of redemption, let us remember, was not imposed upon Him. It was willingly assumed. As the first Adam willingly chose the law of death; He now as the last Adam in a similar exercise of His will, chooses life. His sacrifice then was vicarious. To deny the atoning value of his death is to rob it of every vestige of value for man. If it was only the revelation of love—and I care not how great that may have been—then it was not that which could bring peace for the soul. Its effect upon the soul was to be more than a great persuasive. To conceive of the work of Jesus Christ simply as an intensive revelation of divine love is to describe an experience taking place in man as a result of His death, rather than giving the form and value of His death before God. It was to have value with man, only because it first had value with God. The one to be considered is not man but God in our thought upon the nature of the work of the Christ.

“If the cross is not a redemption it is not a revelation either.” That God can be both just and the justifier of the sinner; that man in his alien state of sin can be touched into the newness of life by God, is to be accounted for not on the grounds of an elegant display of divine love, but rather that He was taking your place as a propitiation for your sins. (Romans 3:25). The outshining of love might bring men to remorse but not to repentance. We must remember that the act of Christ was His act in behalf and instead of man and not something independent of him.

This is the secret of those words on the cross “My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?” Aside from the fact that He was taking your place and mine, they are without meaning—if they are not blasphemy. He has for the moment

forsaken Jesus. This is evident in view of the attitude of God toward the bearer of sin: it was abandonment and this was the position Christ occupied as the sin-bearer for man.

He was standing in the light of defensive love—just where man must stand—and only after He vindicates His perfection is He accepted in the victory of the resurrection. He was taking the place of the sinner and must suffer all that sin brought; not extensive but intensive; but that is the nature of sin. It was not that man had committed many sins and now Christ must suffer in proportion; it was for sin and not sins that He suffered.

The issue of one sin then is not the meaning of His death: It is the same as many. The inevitable issue of sin is to be God-forsaken. If sin is an attempt to overthrow God as King, then its reward will be its own overthrow. In these words we find Jesus testing the meaning of His mission as the sin-bearer for man. He has taken hold of sin and assumed its responsibility for man, and hence must share in its harvest. Paul announces the same fact when he says, "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin in our behalf: that we might become the righteousness of God in Him). (II. Corinthians 5:21).

As the substitute then, of man before the divine law of holiness He tastes the penalty—shall we say of hell, for to be God-forsaken is certainly hell—that your sin might not be reckoned against you and that now through Him you might have access to the Father.

All through this study there has run a question, not visible but nevertheless apparent. It is, the one which inquires as to the reason for the lapse of time between the fall of man and the time of deliverance. In other words why did God wait so many years before He sent His son to man to redeem him? Sin brings moral darkness. Many lessons were to be learned before man could stand the light of the divine person of Christ. What is the secret of polytheism? Why the tendency of man to make unto Himself many gods? Man had lost the sense of the unity of God, and it took years of trial and

hardship for the people of Israel to learn the truth, and abandon their many gods for the true one. God's perfect instrument of manifestation had been ruined, and this fact stayed the hand of reconciliation.

There are many Christs, but there is only one true Christ; it is the Christ of the Cross, atoning for the sin of the world. If His act of redemption is a profound mystery, let us thankfully accept it as that which places us within the possibility of eternal life.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That I am saved by the free act of God's love.
2. That this is effected through the suffering of Jesus Christ, as my substitute.
3. That it was a sacrifice of life, having merit with God and not a mere display of love disguised to subdue the heart into submission.

## STUDY IX.

### THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

John 14:16—"And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever."

It is one thing to know the truth as a matter of information; it is quite another to know it as a matter of experience. The mere knowledge of the history of Christ does not by any means constitute a man a Christian. The world has no small number of men who know the Bible perhaps better than many who call themselves the children of God. But their knowledge is nothing but mere information.

Paul tells us that "the natural mind cannot know the things of God because they are spiritually discerned." The organism by which he is to come into possession of the truth is out of order. Something is needed to pierce the veil of man's darkened understanding and illumine the pathway of divine truth, which will bring not simply a mere knowledge of facts, but a personal appropriation of its responsibility and fruit. Other wise as we shall learn, the effects of the life and death of Christ will have no value for us save as a mere incident in history.

It is the office of the third person of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Ghost, to be unto man this light to blaze the way through his moral darkness to the light of God's truth. That His supreme mission has been misunderstood and even neglected in its application, no one need be told. We have conceived of Him in every possible manner but the right one. We have been so concerned with the merits, etc., of Christ's life and death that we have neglected correctly to understand the character of the agency by which these facts are made known to us. Instead of walking in the Spirit "who searcheth all things yea even the deep things of God" we have proceeded

on our own initiative and our own resources and the result is that to many of us the religion of Christ is either a puzzle or a mere bundle of theories. It is neither in any sense of the term; it is a profound fact available for the salvation of the soul when appropriated correctly.

### HIS PERSON.

Jesus spoke of him as the comforter. This was spoken to personal creatures. He cannot be then a mere influence—even though a moral one; He must be a person. He is not a mere mode either in which God manifests Himself, no more than the Son is a form or mode of revelation of the Father. He is characterized on the pages of the Bible by names, acts, affections and words which designate Him as God. That he is influenced by our attitude toward the truth in Christ, is evidenced by the admonition “Not to grieve the Holy Spirit.” He must then be a person for you need not be told, the impossibility of grieving an impersonal something; it is only personalities that are thus affected.

The same referred to—that of a Comforter—likewise suggests the idea of a person. While present with the apostles, Jesus had been their comfort; and He was a person. Now another comforter was to take His place and be unto them what He has been. It is evident that the promise of a Comforter would have had no significance to them, had they conceived Him in other than personal terms. It is hardly likely that they would have tarried in Jerusalem: it is more unlikely that they would have withstood the persecution of the centuries on the experience of an impersonal power. They must have realized the Comforter promised by Jesus, after a manner similar to that by which they came to estimate Christ Himself.

He is not another being then, but is in His nature true God. (Matthew 28:19, II. Cor. 13:14, Acts 4:3:4). The writers here, you will note, speak of the Holy Spirit not in the neuter but in the masculine gender; it is not ‘it’ but ‘He.’ It is evident



that one who teaches, loves, exhorts, consoles, rebukes, and prays cannot be included in any conception that identifies Him with the exercise of a law, working on the plane of mere physical force.

### HIS WORK.

We are very apt to emphasize the place of Christ to the extent that we lose sight of that occupied by the Holy Spirit. That He has not only a place, but a very important one, is most clearly indicated by Christ Himself. This he outlined in these words: "And when He is come, He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness; and of judgment: of sin because they believe not on Me: of righteousness because I go to my Father and ye see Me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." (John 16:8-11). Also "And He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." (John 16:14). That the Holy Spirit shall guide all men into the truth by presenting and interpreting the truth is the simple form which His mission assumes. To the extent then that we belittle or misunderstand His office, do we deprive ourselves of the full benefits that are to be ours through the merits of Christ's death and resurrection.

His work then in the world is, (1) To convict men of sin. It is the call of man from a life of sin, to one of righteousness. To urge men by the conviction of sin to forsake sin. This is that still small voice that has prompted you to think on holy and sacred things and has urged you to accept their claims.

(2) To enlighten sinners: We noticed in the study of man the inability of man because of his beclouded mind, to see light in its true meaning. That because of the impaired medium of vision, light had become the very opposite, or darkness. He was ignorant of God and sinning because not knowing Him. It is the work of the Holy Spirit to dispell this cloud that has come across the moral vision of man that he may not only see the day, but see it in its plan for him. (Acts 26:18). This is accomplished by holding up the Christ

“who is the light of the world.” If man is all darkness, it will take the light to transform that darkness. This is not only the mission of Christ in the world but that of the Spirit as well. The sun does not create the grass that carpets the earth with its green: it simply floods the earth with its heat and light and the response is the grass. Man yet possessing the ability of response, when brought into touch by the Holy Spirit, with those moral elements akin to those composing God, responds. In the presentation of Jesus Christ we find those elements, so that when we are brought face to face with Him through the Holy Spirit, there is started in man a new consciousness which unfolds into the flower of a new creature through faith; if rejected however, these work the very opposite. It is then by the Holy Spirit holding up before the bars that imprison the mind and heart of man, the Christ as the source of true freedom that man emerges into the state of liberty, and the inheritance of a holy and righteous life.

(3) To sanctify man. This does not simply mean absolute holiness or sinlessness. The modern error here is great. “To sanctify” primarily means “to set apart to a holy work.” Too much of the modern sanctification is not moral. It is but physical. It is not necessarily an evidence of a perfect heart; it may be the outbreak of an imperfect lot of nerves. To set us apart to the work for which we were brought into the world—this is the goal of the agent of sanctification. Once our lives followed the lines of self and sin; now they through this setting apart, follow those of God and righteousness. It is in giving another direction to life, by presenting the true object, both of our life and our love, that the Holy Spirit finds the true sphere of His mission and realizes the ends for which He was sent into the world.

The forms which this new life assumes and by which they are known in scripture are (1) **Conversion**. This is the “**Work of the Holy Spirit** by which, through faith in Christ, we turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God.” (I. Peter 2:25). (2) **Justification**. This “is the act of God

whereby for Christ's sake He counts the believer righteous." (Romans 3:24). (3) **Regeneration**. This "is the work of the **Holy Spirit** by which He makes us new creatures in Christ Jesus" (Peter 1:23, Galatians 6:15). These changes effected in life put us in union with Jesus Christ. If sin distanced man from God, the Holy Spirit brought Him back by revealing the character and extent of that distance. If it placed him in a far country by making him a wanderer and stranger from God, he has been returned to Him, by the Divine Spirit. If through sin, man lost the sovereignty and dominion implied in the initial makeup of his being, it is through the activity of the Holy Spirit that he now regains them. He is truly then a **Comforter**; not in our small and material sense but in the larger one which anticipates man's return as a son to God as the Father. It is the establishment then of that filial relationship characteristic of man before his fall in sin, and which was lived in perfection by Jesus Christ, that constitutes the supreme end of the mission of the Holy Spirit and which marks Him as a real comforter.

### THE RESULTS OF HIS WORK.

The result of His work must be consistent with the plan of His work. It is a new creature with new motives, new loves and new aspirations. It is in short a new man; a new type of citizenship; and hence a new type of society. It is a new community, composed of men with similar hopes, ideals and a similar faith. It is this new society that we call the Church, which is characterized by the pure preaching of the gospel and a correct administration of the sacraments. Its head is Jesus Christ and in Him it finds the realization of itself. He is the principle of its life and aside from Him it has absolutely no warrant for existence.

The Church then as the kingdom of God represented in the faith of men centered in the person of the Christ, is to be defended and protected. To speak against it is to speak against Him who is its head. To live outside of the sphere of

its true influence: to refuse to share its blessings is to repudiate not only the Spirit who created it, but also to ignore Him who is its life and truth. It is here the He is to realize His mission, and its function then can be none other than the conversion of human souls. 'It is not a mere social organism; neither is it designed to solve all the tasks that man might impose upon it. It is here on earth with but one message and that "Jesus Christ and Him crucified: The power of God unto salvation to every one who believes."'

This is its relation to the individual; its relation to the mass is only incidental and effective only when it has once paid its debt to the individual. Its ministry is involved in declaring then not a mere social or political gospel but a spiritual one aimed not at men but at the man. Its great task is to point men to the tree of life and to the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

It is with such a Christ: it is with such a program that the Holy Spirit challenges the best and truest in you for the new life. The ideal of life is not to live at the lowest possible point, but at the highest. The Holy Spirit offering you the riches of Christ as your Savior: the possibility for real peace and joy, calls you to leave the way of the past small and poor in the power of its ideals and fruit, and to walk the 'way of eternal life.' As one made in the image of God before whom you must appear in judgment; as a creature not of time but of immortality, the Spirit of God calls you now to own Him as the Savior of your life and exemplify before the world the qualities that mark the true man: that characterizes the new creature in Christ Jesus.

### CONCLUSION.

1. That the Holy Spirit is a 'person.'
2. That His mission is to convict, enlighten and sanctify sinners.
3. That the result of His effort is the New life in Christ.
4. That the organization of that life today is the Church.

## STUDY X.

### THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.

Acts 2:38—Then Peter said unto them, “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.”

The initial state which characterizes man's reinstatement into the favor of God is called **Salvation**. It is the beginning of a process that is to continue on into eternity. As we have already noted, the steps in this process are, Conversion, Regeneration and Justification. Their work is not always open to the eye neither is it discernible by outward evidences to the individual: “Not by might nor by power but by My Spirit, saith the Lord.” There is no authority to believe that the work of the Holy Spirit is always accompanied by some visible manifestations in our life. Salvation is not feeling: it is not sensation, either mental or physical simply. It is the peace that floods the soul, such as possesses the child as it reposes on its mother's bosom. Do not be looking for visions, etc., such as Paul had, upon the event of your conversion. These may come; that is all with God. But if they do not come do not doubt the presence of His Spirit.

There is a type of moral bigotry that has ruined many a soul. It is that which sets its religious experiences up as a standard or measure for all. Remember that you are a separate individual distinct from every other man and on that basis God deals with you, and the experience of another is no warrant for the assertion that ‘since you did not feel as I did, you are not converted.’ “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved” is the simple but eternal formula. Let this be your guide.

### THE NATURE OF SALVATION.

The call of the Holy Spirit is not an invitation to a new relationship simply—for that could be only external and mer-



cenary—but to a new life. Salvation is not a new bearing of men toward God, neither is it a new moral attitude simply; it is a new creature. Regeneration is not therefore reformation. The latter is incident to the former and an effect rather than a cause. The mere quitting of this and that evil thing, is no guarantee of righteousness.

The plea of Jesus Christ was for a new creature. His demand was for the re-birth of the individual. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." (John 3:3). It means that we must do more than patronize Jesus Christ: we must worship Him as our God and Savior. It is not a new attitude then, but a new condition of the soul. It is a life, marked by new motives of love and honor to God, and not to self: by new impulses—the glory of God and not of self. In short it assumes the attitude of Christ toward God because it has His mind. It is this condition then—the result of a personal appropriation of the merits of Christ's life and death, that puts man in the relationship of a Son. When once this condition is a fact, then the attitude of man will follow, but not before. The former is the creator of the latter. Salvation then is not a respectability; it is not simply moral culture, it is vastly more than a mere common decency; it is life in Jesus Christ.

### THE NECESSITY OF SALVATION.

Man realizes two great facts: (1) That he is constituted essentially of great facts; and (2) that something has intervened to disturb their harmony and unity. It is not upon the presence of these facts but upon the method by which these are to be adjusted and the abnormal condition is to be rectified, that men differ. With the great majority of men it is not facts, but processes that differ them. This is due to the inability of many men to discover that which is essential and fundamental.

That salvation is a necessity, is evidenced upon every page of the Bible. Its teaching leaves no room for doubt as to



its meaning. It not only assumes that man is a sinner, but its pages disclose the only remedy for his sin. If it reveals the disease of man, it likewise shows him the great physician. (John 4:14, 12:32:4-5, Acts 4:12:13:26:38:39:47, Romans 3:21, II. Cor. 5:17, Galatians 2:16, Hebrews 5:9:7:25).

From these statements it is evident that its plan for salvation anticipates a personal acceptance of Jesus Christ. It is upon Him as the mediator of divine grace, that God will recognize the soul; His righteousness and not that of man, is current with Him, and only as man appropriates it, through a living faith in Christ, can he hope to find favor in God's sight. He is the measure of the quality of your moral life. By itself your morality is "as filthy rags" in the sight of God. It will be found in the day when He visits your soul to be weakness instead of strength.

Outlined on every page of the sacred book: implied in the very nature of man is the thought of his salvation on other grounds than those which he can afford. Thus it is that before the name of Christ, "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess."

## THE CONDITION OF SALVATION.

Salvation is not simply a mere display of goodness. Peace with our fellowmen does not necessarily signify peace with our God. It is not simply doing, but pre-eminently **being** good. It is goodness from a pure and new center. It is goodness in behalf of a new object. It is goodness coming from a heart, made pure by the regenerating power of Jesus Christ. It is therefore not a mere negative quality—the mere abstinence from wrong doing—but positively, the assertion of a new power in life. It is goodness with a new and true moral quality because produced at a new center, which is Christ.

This implies two requisites: (1) **Repentance**. (Matthew 3:2, Luke 3:8, Acts 3:19). This does not imply the forgetting, or even the forsaking of the past. It is contrition. It

is 'heart-sorrow for sin.' Neither is repentance and remorse identical. The latter is sorrow caused by the discovery of our acts of sin by our fellowmen; the former is sorrow that comes because we recognize them to be contrary to the will of a loving God. The latter is concerned with the reputation, the former with the character. Remorse comes to the thief when he is discovered and apprehended by the law; repentance only when he feels himself guilty before a just God. It therefore implies the utter forsaking of our sin (Romans 12:2).

(2) **Faith.** (John 6:29:47:11:25, Romans 3:28). This is not a mere belief in the historical facts of the Bible. You can believe these and still be lost. This type of faith is the possession of every formalist. It is not the mere acceptance of a biblical statement or proposition that constitutes faith. The mere knowledge of a few moral facts does not count for faith. Faith, is moral surrender of the soul, resulting from an interpretation of these facts by the Holy Spirit. It is the realization of the benefits of these facts by trust in Jesus Christ. Faith is surrender upon the basis of a knowledge of Christ, produced by the Holy Spirit through the word and sacraments; this constitutes the heart of faith. Faith then is not an act of the mind simply, but the resignation of the heart, upon the enlightenment of the moral value of the facts of the Bible, as interpreted by the Divine Spirit.

It is first knowing Christ through the Spirit's activity and a consequent surrender to Him, that illustrates the ideal faith. As such therefore it is not the creation of man. Man in sin, unlike and ignorant of God, cannot take the initiative in making this surrender. It is not the work of human hands but of divine ones. Now the most rational thing to suppose—aside from the statement of Scripture—is that God is the author of this state of the soul. For if man is unable to create the condition primarily for his return to God, he would be equally unable to afford the proper means by which that condition could be appropriated. To the truth of this the

Scripture bears ample testimony. "For by grace are ye saved through faith: and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8).

But a question arises at this point: Why specify **faith** as the only means? Is it because it is demanded simply on the pages of the Bible? Or putting it another way, Why does God require faith at all? Faith represents the normal and ideal attitude of man to God. There is no less of faith before the Fall nor was there any more of faith after it. Faith therefore was normal and natural with man. It was sin that destroyed this ideal relationship and made it necessary for God to intervene not only in behalf of the making of a plan for man's return to Him, but also in giving him the means by which this plan could become a part of his experience.

It was faith in the Devil and distrust of God, that led the first man astray; it was the ideal faith and consequent obedience that enabled the last and ideal man to remain within the circle of perfect communion. Consequently it is faith in God on the merits of His plan realized in the God-Man, that can bring man back to his place in the divine economy. Faith therefore is the only means by which you can be saved, because it is the necessary and rational condition, consistent with the nature of both God and man. (Romans 3:22:19:4:9, Galatians 2:16, Philippians 3:9).

But faith does not come to man by chance. (Ephesians 2:8). It comes to us from God through appointed means. These means are the Word of God and the Sacraments: Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

It is these that not only afford the medium for faith, but do so by crystalizing the presentation of Christ, into faith. By these means we not only acquire the faith which brings us into the kingdom of God, but also that which enables us to stay there. No man has ever been converted, except through the Word of God; and no man has ever remained converted who has neglected or repudiated baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first sign of moral degeneration and spiritual

falling away from God is the slight use made of these means of grace.

This is in light of the method employed by which faith is started and maintained in the life. This is in view of the value of faith to God and its necessity on the part of man to share the divine favor. It carries out our contention of the vital relationship between faith and the means of grace. It evidences its fundamental character in the Christian life; it is the prerequisite to full heritage in the future of the Son of God. These are facts, not of human reason, but of divine revelation.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That salvation is a new life and not a mere reformation of life.

2. That it is absolutely necessary to eternal peace.

3. That it comes only through a personal surrender to Jesus Christ.

4. That the means of its appropriation is the Holy Spirit operating through the Word and Sacrament.

## STUDY XI.

### THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.

I. John 3:4—"Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law."

In the studies that have preceded we have in a brief manner touched upon this one. It is hardly possible to consider the history of man and that of God as He is related to him, without taking this fact into consideration. It is because of the large place this fact holds in the life of man, that we undertake a larger study of the same. In fact a reality that is so prevalent and persistent and one that enters so widely into every phase of human activity, and especially the moral one, should have a prominent place in our thinking.

We have spoken of the existence of Sin as a fact. This is evident both in the persistent and yet unsuccessful attempts on the part of man to account for it, on purely natural grounds, and the insistent manner with which it injects its life into that of man. From the days of Adam till now its presence is witnessed by a moral fruitage that has baffled every effort of man to correct it, and was responsible for the greatest disclosure of God, recorded in all history. (John 15:20:22). To change its name is not to change its character; for its relation to man is not one affecting the body but the soul: the former is the result of the latter. It is not merely an **external** burden but more especially an **internal** condition that affects man at the seat of his moral life.

#### WHAT IT IS.

Sin implies a relationship: and that on a standard fixed and settled. The nature of sin being moral—as we have indicated—it is reasonable to conclude that the standard must likewise be moral. The relationship then is not physical but spiritual, with which sin has to do. But sin also implies



the existence and exercise of the highest point in the being of man, and the standard by which it is judged, must then be of the highest moral order which can be none other than God Himself. It implies the exercise of free will. It then has to do not only with the **acts** of man, but more particularly with his **nature**.

Here is the popular error. Sin is not an act, neither is it a series of acts: it is a disposition, a character, and a nature. It is not something superficial in man; it is a part of his very existence. It is responsible for his acts, and lies at the bottom of every move away from God.

It is very true that the Bible speaks of it as the transgression of the law (I. John 3:6), but we inquire what is law? What is it in government and society? Is it not the 'will' of those composing it? If otherwise, why is it that any disobedience or defiance of that law, (or will), is interpreted as a blow at government or society? If government is not the 'will' of the persons governed, then anything like punishment would be impossible. Guilt is based upon an act of disobedience directed against personal will. We saw that as God is personal, sin thus must be a blow at the moral government of God, as disobedience here is a blow not simply against one law, but against the whole structure of society. This is the spirit of responsibility and of sin. Conceived then as 'will' we can see that sin is not an act against a mere arbitrary decree of man, but it is a rebellion against the will of God, which represents the exercise of the very nature of God. Sin then is a blow at the plan and in the face of the divine creator. To refuse loyalty and obedience to that will is considered as open defiance to God Himself. In fact this is the very end and intention of sin.

Sin is not something that man has taken on in the late years of his history, then. It is not confined to the years of adulthood. It lies at the very bottom of the history of man and fundamentally of his being. Thus we speak of original sin, which is defined as "the thorough corruption of



human nature, which by the Fall of our first parents, is deprived of original righteousness and is prone to every evil." It is then to be found not only in the adult but in the child and infant as well. It is the spring from which flows all the bitter and polluting waters that come in after-life. Instead of original holiness and purity there have come their direct opposite, the state of depravity and sin. It is this state of unlikeness to God, that not only affords the source of actual transgression, but which merits His great displeasure and wrath. (Genesis 5:3, Job 15:14;25:4, Psalms 51:5, Galatians 3:22, Romans 5:12;3:19).

The most popular and evident form of sin is selfishness. In fact it is of the very essence of sin itself. It is essentially the deification of self, which was the end held out to the first Adam, and which proved his undoing. It is the setting up of another to be God, which is the very root-philosophy of all present day heathenism. In fact it represents the end for which sin is striving: the ultimate overthrow of God. It is an easier task to conquer man in his attempt to be God, than God Himself: This was the evident plan of the devil.

### WHY IS SIN?

Man is a free creature because he was made in the image of God who represents this quality in perfection, and supremacy. Sin is simply this freedom misdirected; it is free will abused and captivated by the enemy. Man's nature was constituted to bring honor to his creator: sin is man missing the mark, for which he was created. The law of freedom was in the life of man, before his fall, and is therefore a part of his very nature. If man was to remain man, it was impossible for even God to have intervened and prevented the first sin.

For man is essentially a part of God, and to have denied man here, would mean that He would deny Himself and this He cannot do. The same holds true today. Should He step into the arena of man's life and annihilate sin, man would be

dethroned and unmade. He would cease to be man, and become but a mere machine. If he is to remain a free creature—and consequently man—he must be allowed the free exercise of this capacity, i. e. the power of free choice.

It is likewise true should God intervene to the complete destruction of sin, it would mean His overthrow also, since He would be destroying in man, which is also supreme in His own nature. In His outlook then upon sin, He must not only consider the immediate state of man, but his future one as well. It would be different if we could imagine sin existent without man. Man is the center of God's concern, which is evident from the character of the remedy for sin provided in Jesus Christ.

Man's attitude then toward truth determines his future state. Hence the gospel is either "a savour of life unto life: or of death unto death." (II. Cor. 2:16). It is the power of God unto salvation upon the condition of faith (Romans 1:16) and not upon any work or effort we may put forth; it is the power unto death, when we spurn its call to life and turn our hearts against its offers and claims.

### THE ATTITUDE OF GOD TOWARD SIN.

That it is one of hatred is plain throughout the Bible. (Deuteronomy 25:16, Psalms 5:4). That He has no pleasure in sin, is most consistent with what we know Him to be. But while He hates sin with an eternal hatred, He yet loves the sinner as intensely. (John 3:16). The secret of the oriental conception of God in the light of eternal anger and displeasure, is the result (1st) of ignorance of what He is and (2nd) of the relation of man to Him. Man and sin are not identical in their destiny only in so far as man chooses it to be so. While God has willed the overthrow of sin, He has willed the enthronement of man to his rightful place in His favor.

It took the death of His Son, to correct the human error at this point, and to provide for man's restoration to that place where he realizes the real ends of his creation.

The act by which God restores man, is born in a new attitude toward him. We call it forgiveness. This is an act which can be done by God alone. There is absolutely no warrant in the Bible, for the practice whereby certain men have tried to forgive sins. Man can 'declare' the forgiveness of sins in view of the fulfillment of certain conditions on the part of man, but **never** absolutely pardon them. This is reserved to God alone. Man can declare the **conditions** but not the **act** of forgiveness. Forgiveness is universal upon the universal application of the merits of Christ's death and resurrection. This is in view of the universality of sin. For no man is without sin. (I. John 1:8-10). The history of the Apostle Paul as outlined in Romans the seventh chapter, is the experience of man universal. Peace comes only, when through pardon, man is reinstated in the divine favor.

There is a state of sin, possible however which is beyond the pale of forgiveness: this is called the 'unpardonable' sin. (Matthew 12:31). This sin consists in blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Two points must be noted in its study; (1st) the significance of the word 'to blaspheme;' and (2nd) this in view of the mission of the Holy Spirit. The word 'blaspheme' signifies in its root meaning "to bring to naught." We conceived the work of the Holy Spirit to be the presentation and interpretation of Jesus Christ to the individual so as to work salvation in his life. The unpardonable sin then must be that attitude of the individual toward the work of the Holy Spirit, which includes the whole range of holy and sacred operations of God, which results in the frustration of His work. But to be able to do this presupposes a former acquaintance and intimacy with the Holy Spirit; it argues a former knowledge of the light and truth. It refers then to a possible state in the man who has once tasted of the gift of God but who has fallen from His favor. The man who was once a Christian, but who now by his life and talk ridicules the things that are holy and sacred is a fit subject for the unpardonable sin.

It is true that it is possible for the unregenerate man to sin away his day of grace, when the Spirit of God will no longer strive with him; but we do not conceive this to be specifically the unpardonable sin. The one is such a falling away from that which he once loved and worshiped, till now he hates and opposes with the same ardor with which he first loved; the other is that state in a sinner's life where he no longer has the capacity to perceive the Spirit's call to salvation. Both are an example of self, attempting to realize its highest self in spite of the divine will of God.

The glory of both is short lived and soon they will find themselves face to face with the reality of their awful doom. It is not only rational but necessary for you to forsake it for it is consigned by a just God to an awful future in which you will share, if you choose to follow it. To love sin is not only to enjoy its apparent and transient pleasures, but to share in the awful tragedy of its end.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That sin is disobedience to the will of God.
2. That it is a part of the nature of man.
3. That it is possible only because of the free will of man.
4. That God hates sin and will forever punish it.

## STUDY XII.

### THE DOCTRINE OF PRAYER.

Luke 11:1—"And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples."

Prayer is not the creation of any one religion; it belongs to no one age. It is to be found in the history of every race and tribe; it is as old as man himself. It is not simply confined to man in his fallen state; it is true also of man unfallen. It is true that we have no instance of prayer before the Fall, but from what we know of man and his relation to the world it is reasonable to suppose that he held communion with his creator before his awful apostacy. The Fall while necessitating a type of prayer that perhaps did not prevail before it, emphasized it in a manner and gave to it a touch that would be impossible before the Fall. It is true that innocence has equal need of prayer with imperfection.

The great masters at prayer have been few in the world's history. In fact the world has seen only one truly great man, whose excellency was manifest at this point. It was the ideal man: Christ Jesus. It was at His feet that the world has learned the simplicity, nature and power of prayer. In fact it is His name that gives it the qualities that mark it as such. It is here that we must feel the throb of its revelation and the calm of its peace.

We have from His lips what is known around the world as the 'Lord's Prayer.' It came in response to the request of His apostles "Lord teach us to pray." It is the most concise and yet the most comprehensive prayer known. It has been the pattern for all prayer since that time. In the introduction, "Our Father who art in Heaven," we realize that God is a father and possessed of the qualities that must constitute



a father. In the first petition, "Hallowed be Thy Name," we are taught to recognize His name as holy at all times. In the second petition, "Thy Kingdom Come," we ask that the rule of God may be realized in perfection here. In the third petition, "Thy Will be Done on Earth as it is in Heaven," we ask God that He will give us grace to help realize the will of God—be that for pain or pleasure—on earth as it is realized in Heaven. The fourth petition, "Give us This Day Our Daily Bread," aims to bring us with a thankful heart before Him for all His benefits; it implies not only earthly but heavenly blessings as well. In the fifth petition, "Forgive us Our Trespases as We Forgive Those Who Trespass Against Us," we pray that God might give us a penitent heart and remember no longer our sins against us. In the sixth petition, "And Lead us Not Into Temptation," we pray for the guardianship of God against the wiles of the devil, and His protection against every temptation to do evil. In the seventh petition, "But Deliver us From Evil," we ask that we be delivered not only from the results of sin, but from sin itself. The **conclusion**, "For Thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory Forever and Ever, Amen," sums up the whole prayer, and reveals both the end of prayer and also the assurance of an answer to our petitions. It is the master prayer and every man should know it. It should be early on the lips of every child. It reveals (1st) what constitutes real prayer, and (2nd) it shows its necessity.

### WHAT PRAYER IS.

It is not simply the utterance of a few words and sentences. It is not the recitation of a few finely joined phrases. It is by far not a speech to our maker. It is not a talking into the air. It is an address of the soul to God. We do not then **say** our prayers: we **pray** them. Let us guard against 'saying' the Lord's Prayer: we 'pray' it. Many a prayer because of this error, is no more than a mere presumptuous display of human knowledge. It is lacking the spiritual element and



hence is irreverant, because of its human familiarity. No man who recognizes that 'God is great: yea very great,' will ever come in a light and flippant attitude before Him. God cannot honor that prayer that is only a mere exhibition of grammar or words. He cannot answer the prayer that comes only from the lips.

Many have been tempted into a wrong spirit in prayer because of their desire to pray in public. In fact we know men who think it an indictment of a man's religion if he is unable to pray in public. This is far from the truth of the matter. It has been our observation that some men's prayers reveal an awful deficiency in their religious experience and it had been better with them had they never attempted to pray in public. We have heard some prayers on the house top that should have been made in the closet; it would have been more edifying to all, we are sure. If you wish to utter your petition in public, better by far read a prayer than run the risk of coming to God in a manner that does not befit a worshiper.

Prayer ought to have preparation, as well as any other religious expression of life. No man has a right to think he must have training and preparation to present himself before an assembly of men to make known his wants, and none whatever when he presents himself before his God. It is a presumption that has no warrant, either in the Bible or in good judgment. If you cannot pray so as to bring honor to the name of your God, learn the 'Lord's Prayer' or one of the beautiful prayers from our Church hymnal in which we are sure you will be able to worship Him just as acceptably.

Prayer as 'the sincere desire of the heart,' ought to lift us very close to our Christ. It should have in it, adoration, confession and thanksgiving. These elements should characterize every prayer. It should comprehend and include all these. Real prayer is the soul asking of God, and the character of the same will be commensurate with our conception of our needs.

Not only do our own necessities urge us to prayer, but the Bible as well (Matthew 7:7), "Ask and it shall be given you." (Luke 18:21) "men ought always to pray and not faint." But our prayers should not only be at stated times; we are told; "pray without ceasing" (I. Thes. 5:17) that is we are admonished to be always in a frame of mind for prayer. Here is the great element of strength for the Christian. This is his secret power, on the street as well as in the home: in the Counting House as well as in the Sanctuary.

Prayer puts us in contact with divine strength and enables the soul to be clothed with divine power. It is **not** a **means of grace** for in it the individual goes to God, and yet as a result of its place in life, we are brought into touch with God's favor. Linked with faith we are told to ask anything and expect it. It enables man to appropriate those factors which give him victory over care, trouble, want, temptation and the power of the evil one. It is then a necessity. No life can be without it and maintain its identity long as a Christian life. When man stops praying he cuts himself off from the fountain head, and his stream of living water will soon dry up.

### TO WHOM SHOULD WE PRAY?

We have in some manner anticipated our answer, in our study of what prayer is. The introduction of the model prayer "Our Father" gives likewise the answer. It is to none other than God. For this we have the authority of Jesus Himself. We do not need the council of men. (Matthew 4:10, Philipians 4:6). There is neither scripture nor reason that justifies any man in praying to a saint. It is a type of idolotry and ought to be discountenanced at all times. It is the echo of an age long since passed. It smacks of the heathen and has absolutely no place in Christian worship. It brings no small reflection upon both the Word and Work of Christ.

Why should any man pray to a saint, to pray to Jesus, to pray to God, when we are told to come boldly before a throne of grace? Why belittle both the Word of God here and also

the ability of Christ? As believers in the 'universal priesthood of all believers' we cannot give our sanction to such legalism. It is not only foreign to the real end and spirit of prayer, but also contrary to the command of Christ Himself. The prayer that is directed to the Virgin Mary we consider as sacrilege and a dishonor to Christ and to God. It belittles the divine by the introduction of the human element into the plan by which man comes before his God. It is based on ignorance and fosters the spirit of decay and stagnation in religion rather than that of progress.

This type of teaching which emphasizes human agencies in man's approach to God, is a reflection upon the sufficiency of the divine one and discredits the power of Christ as our **one** great Advocate with the Father. ("If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (I. John 2:1). It is then not only contrary to the real spirit and intent of prayer, but an awful shock to the moral culture and sensibility of the soul. It is evidence of the presence of the crude and gross: it is an emphasis on the natural, to the neglect of the spiritual qualities of man. It represents a crude materialism in religion. This type of prayer is a mere mumble of words and devoid of all real spiritual significance. Compared with the 'Lord's Prayer' it is mere mockery.

### FOR WHAT SHOULD WE PRAY?

First for things that are consistent and in perfect harmony with the moral height of our nature. It should anticipate both the uplift of human life and the honor of God. It should aim not only to bring the soul into closer touch with its God, but it should magnify His name among men as well. Our prayer then should be directed toward moral objects and should anticipate moral ends. Our asking in prayer should then not be haphazard. It ought not confine itself to the material needs alone. It should have primarily in view the spiritual needs of the soul: others should be secondary. Prayer then is

a serious business. It is to realize the greatest ends. If we can once recognize the true majesty of God, the real value and meaning of prayer will be evident.

But all prayer **to be of value must** be given in the name of Jesus Christ. "Whatsoever ye shall ask in **my** name, that will I do." (John 14:13). "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matthew 18:20). It is not words then that give prayer the basis of its surety; it is the name of Christ. With His name omitted prayer is not prayer at all and finds no acceptance with God. In the New Testament sense, and this must be our guide in the very nature of the case, such prayer dishonors God.

But there is another element in prayer—to which we alluded on another page—which completes its value for us: that is Faith. We are admonished to ask in "faith," believing, for it is impossible to please God without faith. To pray without faith is to dishonor God and to disappoint the soul. Better not pray at all than to pray with this element left out. The promise that God will hear and man receive, is based on our asking in faith. Our expectations should measure up with our faith: and our faith should measure up to our needs.

### CONCLUSION.

1. Prayer is the sincere request of the heart, either in secret or public.
2. It must be to God.
3. It must be in the **name** of Christ.
4. It must be accompanied by Faith.

## STUDY XIII.

# THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM: ITS NATURE AND NECESSITY.

John 3:5—"Jesus answered, Verily, Verily, I say unto thee except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

It was noted in a former study that the ordinary approach of the Holy Spirit to the soul was through divinely appointed means. It was likewise noted that one of these means was 'Baptism.' The sacrament of Baptism is most important (1) because of its prominent place in the teaching of Christ and the apostles; and (2) because of the import which it carries for man.

For Christ it was one of the central thoughts. It is to be found among the last words to the leadership of the early Church. "Go and Baptize." Its place in the great plan of salvation was not only authorized but necessitated by Christ, and hence it always had a large place in his thoughts. So much so that it is impossible to conceive of a soul coming into a new relationship with its God without placing the act of baptism at the beginning of that life. We have come to believe from its representation on the pages of the Bible, that it is the **normal** manner of entry into the kingdom of God, and that any other way must be attended by hazard. The emphasis given to this doctrine in the Bible apparently warrants us in making it the absolute way of entry into the kingdom; we shall discover however, that this claim is not made for it.

## THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

No one can examine the scripture on this subject without discovering that baptism is neither a mere incidental matter in the divine plan of salvation, nor it is an optional matter with



man. Its place in the teachings of Christ argue for it great significance.

This is due to the divine principle implied in baptism. It is a divinely appointed means whereby the Holy Spirit comes into the life of man, to call him to salvation and to identify him with the life of Christ. It is then not a mere seal or sign of salvation. It is here that we have worked great havoc with both the sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in robbing them of their real import by eliminating from them just as much of their moral value as possible without destroying them. It is a mark of real spiritual insight to be able to see not only the symbol but also that which is symbolized.

While it is true that baptism is the means by which the individual is inducted into a new life in Christ, this is only absolute with the child, since he is unable to grasp the written Word; with the adult however the Word has precedence because it is here that the Holy Spirit first arouses him to a sense of his sin and need of salvation.

It stands then at the very portal of divine grace, and to under-estimate it not only belittles the sacrament itself, but brings reproach upon the Divine Spirit who gives it its peculiar value. It is then not a mere act of man. Its essential nature comprehends more than a mere performance although it be done under a moral guise. Baptism "is not mere water, but such as is comprehended and included in the Word and command of God, and sanctified by them, so that it is nothing else than a water of God or a divine water." This does not mean that it of itself is of more value than other water but that God's Word and command are added to it, which give to it its peculiar place in the Christian economy of salvation.

Its substance and value then is not in the character of the administrator but in the act and words: 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' Baptism even by a heretic would be valid. Hence the Lutheran Church states that in cases of emergency any Christian man or



woman can administer the rite of baptism however being careful to state the same for record in the Church.

Baptism has both an earthly and a heavenly side to it: the water—its earthly side—together with its connection with the activity of the Holy Spirit, its heavenly side. Since water was used both in the Old Testament, and the New Testament to signify cleansing and purification it is necessary to use only water then in the administration of this sacrament. To use another element is to destroy its place as a sacrament.

With baptism then as an avenue for the Holy Spirit's activity with the soul, it is a matter of interest to know what benefits come as a result of this contact. Are they of primary importance or are they of only secondary value? Our answer to this question will reflect not only our conception of baptism but likewise our conception of the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection. For it is these facts that qualify this sacrament as such and give it a place in God's will for the highest interests of the soul.

The primary design of baptism is the offering, applying, confirming, and sealing of redeeming grace. Through baptism man enters into the fullness of divine grace and begins the life which is to end only in the realization of the full stature of the Christ. Through baptism man stands before God as a sin-pardoned and redeemed son. It brings him forgiveness of sins, (John 3:5, Acts 2:28) salvation and the full inheritance of the wealth of Jesus Christ, (Romans 6:3, Galatians 3:27) and consequently newness of life (Colossians 2:11).

Upon the extent however of this cleansing and the scope of its work there is no consensus of opinion. That is, there is no common agreement as to the depth of its benefits in the nature of man.

Does it include sin as such or simply its fruits? The Roman Catholic Church teaches that in baptism sin is destroyed. This is meant to include its entire destruction. The Lutheran Church does not accept this as do none of the evangelical

Churches of Protestantism. It does however, teach 'that the **guilt** and **dominion** of sin are taken away by baptism, but not the **root** or **incentive** to sin.' Baptism removes the guilt of sin but not the inclination to sin. Man is by nature, we learned, depraved and this, as the father of all outward sin, is not taken away in baptism. Hence Paul cried out "who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" This is not the cry of one man but of many; it is not only the constant experience of Paul; it is that of the race as well. In spite of all that has been done for man to effect his return to God, the heart of humanity realizes the awful presence of that which makes the heart "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." This baptism cannot fully eradicate from the heart.

### ITS NECESSITY.

Baptism from its relation to the teaching of Christ and its consequent place in the plan for man's redemption, then is more than a mere ceremony; it is even more than a mere rite. It holds everything that is implied in the name 'sacrament.' If the latter be conceived as a divine means by which God comes to man in terms of salvation, it is very evident that baptism is that very means by which the soul is initiated into the new life. Hence its place is at the very beginning of man's conversion. With such an import attached to baptism, we feel that its place in the thinking and life of the individual must be great. It was placed as one of the first steps by Jesus in the salvation of man. "Except a man—Greek: 'any one'—be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This is a comprehensive statement and one that rings with the note of finality. That these words are those of Jesus Himself also adds weight to its place and consideration. No amount of jugglery can make 'water and spirit' identical. There is no other place in the Bible where this is shown, and cannot here mean anything else than that baptism is the ordinary and normal manner of entry into the kingdom.

It is not a mere expedient; but the ideal way provided by

God by which man is brought into the kingdom. Expedients are never resorted to in the physical world except in cases of emergency; the same procedure holds true likewise in the moral world. Jesus was attempting to bring Nicodemus within the light of the new life and birth. Is it to be supposed that He would speak in figures of speech at so critical a time? No; He must have had in mind a divine act which was to simplify somewhat the mystery of the new birth.

But there is another saying of Jesus bearing on this point, which we must consider with the foregoing one: "Go ye into all the world—he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Matthew 16:15-16). A study of these two statements of Jesus—one made at the very beginning and the other at the close of His ministry—will reveal, (1st) that baptism is the way prescribed for entrance into the possession of His gift; and (2nd) that faith on the part of man is the element that gives it value for him. Its necessity then is not absolute but ordinary. But this gives us no liberty to indifference as to this sacrament. We have no right to impose our case on the long-suffering favor of God. We are within the truth when we state as our belief that baptism is always necessary and God's will in this matter is never changed except in necessary cases. These however are at his discretion and not at that of man. We have no moral right whatever to interfere in the divine plans for the soul, and will not do so except we are opposing **Him**. It is not the absence of baptism but our opposition to it that condemns: "He that believeth not shall be damned," carries out this interpretation. Unbelief, even with the sacrament of baptism would not bring salvation; it would on the other hand bring condemnation.

Man then can be saved in extreme cases by faith, without this saving ordinance; but never with the saving ordinance, with faith left out. And then it is a most unreasonable thing to suppose that any man who would oppose this sacrament, would or could have faith with such a state of heart. Love to

Christ implies a love and friendliness to all which He instituted and sanctioned; the reverse is likewise true. Baptism is then a channel of divine grace, whose benefits are assured to you through your faith, wrought by the Holy Spirit, through the Word. Its value to you depends not upon mere water but upon your faith, in Jesus Christ.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That baptism is the appointed means of grace.
2. That it is necessary in the ordinary sense.
3. That it is opposition to the sacrament and not its absence, that condemns.
4. That faith must accompany baptism.

## STUDY XIV.

### THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM: THE MODE.

Mark 16:16—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

In the previous study we stated that 'Baptism' is water comprehended and included in the Word and command of God. This statement is not however universally accepted. There are approximately 447,000,000 Christians in the world and of this number about 10,000,000 insist upon quite another definition of this ordinance. We are told that "baptism is **mode** and nothing else;" that it refers not to the sacrament as such, but rather to the mode of its administration. This has tended to widen the breach between the Christian forces and its result in part is a divided and bigoted Christendom. It is no common occurrence to hear some of the more insistent 'modistes' state that all are lost who are not 'Immersed.' That the 'mode' of baptism, and the elements that qualify it as such are not identical, we believe, will be evident from two considerations.

#### I.—FROM REASON.

If it be accepted that in baptism God confers divine grace, it is evident that we cannot confine Him to any one mode in accomplishing this end. We saw that baptism, while a means of grace, does not confine God to its use absolutely; then why should we confine Him to any one mode, when He does use it? To state that He is confined to any one mode in the bestowal of His favor upon man, is not only inconsistent with what we have conceived Him to be, but also contrary with His operations in the realm of nature, etc. It is not within the province of man to limit God in His work, either in nature or in grace. If there is to be any limitation it shall be assumed by Him, of His own free will. This was true in the form which the incarnation took; it must likewise be true by analogy in the bestowal of the effects of that incarnation.

Christ implies a love and friendliness to all which He instituted and sanctioned; the reverse is likewise true. Baptism is then a channel of divine grace, whose benefits are assured to you through your faith, wrought by the Holy Spirit, through the Word. Its value to you depends not upon mere water but upon your faith, in Jesus Christ.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That baptism is the appointed means of grace.
2. That it is necessary in the ordinary sense.
3. That it is opposition to the sacrament and not its absence, that condemns.
4. That faith must accompany baptism.



## STUDY XIV.

### THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM: THE MODE.

Mark 16:16—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

In the previous study we stated that 'Baptism' is water comprehended and included in the Word and command of God. This statement is not however universally accepted. There are approximately 447,000,000 Christians in the world and of this number about 10,000,000 insist upon quite another definition of this ordinance. We are told that "baptism is **mode** and nothing else;" that it refers not to the sacrament as such, but rather to the mode of its administration. This has tended to widen the breach between the Christian forces and its result in part is a divided and bigoted Christendom. It is no common occurrence to hear some of the more insistent 'modistes' state that all are lost who are not 'Immersed.' That the 'mode' of baptism, and the elements that qualify it as such are not identical, we believe, will be evident from two considerations.

#### I.—FROM REASON.

If it be accepted that in baptism God confers divine grace, it is evident that we cannot confine Him to any one mode in accomplishing this end. We saw that baptism, while a means of grace, does not confine God to its use absolutely; then why should we confine Him to any one mode, when He does use it? To state that He is confined to any one mode in the bestowal of His favor upon man, is not only inconsistent with what we have conceived Him to be, but also contrary with His operations in the realm of nature, etc. It is not within the province of man to limit God in His work, either in nature or in grace. If there is to be any limitation it shall be assumed by Him, of His own free will. This was true in the form which the incarnation took; it must likewise be true by analogy in the bestowal of the effects of that incarnation.

Then again the efficacy of divine grace is not confined to nor is it dependent upon, modes of bestowal. This is true in every sphere of life. Potatoes possess no greater food value whether eaten with a fork of gold, or with the fingers. Soup is no better if eaten with a silver spoon, than if eaten with a pewter one. It might be better form and etiquette to choose the former, but so far as the value of the food for the body is concerned no change takes place here. The value depends upon the ability of the physical organism to appropriate and assimilate the food, and this is just what we say about baptism. It is the individual ability through faith to accept the benefits of baptism, and not its mode, that constitutes its value.

It is hardly possible that after all these years of research and study upon this subject that one man can indict 45 men and prove his case. It does not seem within reason that ten million people can charge 437 million with being without the New Testament meaning of baptism and see their charge triumph. One man can hang a jury but he cannot by such action vindicate the prisoner.

## II.—FROM REVELATION.

Our conclusion—that the mode of baptism is not synonymous with the ordinance itself and that it does not effect its moral value—is further borne out by an induction into the subject as stated on the pages of the Bible itself. (1) It does not specify any one particular mode of baptism. It no where indicates any prescribed or stated mode for this act. Neither does the name for this sacrament indicate any such mode. The Greek word used in the New Testament to signify baptism is ‘baptizo.’ It has—and always has had—two meanings: (1st) The one used by the Greek-or-un-Christian-writers to denote the sinking of a ship, the sinking of a horse in the mud up to its neck, etc., and as such meant ‘to dip,’ ‘to sink’ or ‘to immerse;’ the (2nd) that one used in the Bible for purification and cleansing. Mark 7:4 says, “and many other

things there be, which they have received to hold, as the 'washing' of cups etc.'" In Hebrews 9:10 we read, "which stood in meats and drinks of divers 'washings'" Luke 11:38 says "and when the Pharisee saw it he marveled that he had not first 'washed' before dinner." The words, "washing," "washed" and "washings," employed here, all come from the word 'baptizo.' The reference in Luke is noteworthy in view of the oriental custom of pouring water on the hands, which would indicate that when the Jew 'baptized' his hands for dinner it was by pouring.

It is certainly not the form or mode assumed by baptism then that the New Testament writers are noting, but rather its benefits; not its letter but its spirit. Two facts are then evident from the foregoing: (1) That to identify the mode of baptism with the sacrament itself, we are obliged to go to heathen writers for our word in which to cast it. This is recognized by Rev. Carson a leader in the Disciple church in his book "on the defense of 'immersion' as baptism," when he says, "we are indebted to the heathen for our meaning of the word 'baptizo'" and (2) that not the mode, but the effects of baptism are concerned in the origin of this sacrament.

We wish to candidly inquire, Why do we need to go to the heathen for our meaning of that word which signifies this most holy sacrament? Is it possible that its true significance is not to be found in the Bible? If our conclusions are to be consistent with the real import and meaning of the gospel at every point, we must seek from **its** pages the forms in which to cast them and not from those of heathen writers. If this holy act is to be understood it can only be so, by a study of its significance at the hands of the leadership indicated in the Bible. The views of the heathen should have no weight with bible students on Christian sacraments, at least.

And again: if the form of any ordinance of the Bible, determines its value; if the manner in which we conduct it, determines its contribution to the soul, we fear some radical

changes must be made at other points than that of baptism. At the institution of the Lord's Supper no woman was present: only the Apostles and Jesus. Also the position of the men was a reclining one. Also the mere fact of eating bread and drinking wine does not constitute the Lord's Supper. It is something more than that—as we shall presently see. So water may be poured, sprinkled or we may be dipped a thousand times and yet not be baptized. If we are to be consistent, we should exclude all women from the Lord's Table and recline instead of kneel or stand. Neither do we conform, in form and words, our prayers to the Lord's Prayer. This does not, however, invalidate prayer.

Thus a man may be immersed till he touches the bottom and have a classical or heathen baptism but not necessarily a Christian one. It takes something more than a mere dipping or even sprinkling to constitute a real biblical baptism.

### THE BIBLE AND BAPTISM.

With the Bible then as our guide, we shall hear what it has to say on this point (1st) HOW WAS JESUS BAPTIZED? It is most natural to reason the proper mode—if any one in particular—of baptism from that which marked the baptism of Jesus. In Matthew 3:16, we have the words which apparently express the mode as that of immersion; “and Jesus when He was baptized went up straightway out of the water etc.” This quotation is from the St. James Version of the Bible. The revised version states however that “He went up straightway **‘from’** the water.” This shatters the former conclusion and shows clearly that no possible significance can be attached to these words so far as denoting the specific mode of the baptism of Jesus. It is weighty evidence—as we shall presently see—against any conclusion, announced as final, that has no firmer basis than a phrase or sentence of words. We must have a more solid foundation if it is to stand the test.

And then again the words ‘Straightway, out of the water’

cannot indicate the mode of baptism in any sense of the case, consistent with sound reason. A study of the scene in Acts 8:38, will plainly show this conclusion to be correct. It is said of Philip and the Eunuch, that “they went down **both** into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him, and when **they** were come up out of the water etc.” Now if the phrase ‘down into and up from’ signifies immersion, then the Bible must be wrong in its conclusion relative to the baptism of the Eunuch. For this is said of both Philip and the Eunuch, that ‘they **both** went down into—and came up out of’ and has just as much value for one as for the other. It means then that if the Eunuch was down under the water, then Philip must have been also; and in that case how could there have been any baptism? But the Bible says the Eunuch was baptized and hence must have been by some other mode than that of imersion.

Christ we believe was baptized by some other mode than immersion. What was that mode? In Heb. 9:11, we read, “but Christ being come an high priest of good things to come;” in Numbers 8:5-7, we are told how the high priest was set apart to his holy office, “and then shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purifying upon them etc.” Christ then being the great high priest, is inducted into his office by the ‘sprinkling of water.’ He recognizes the relation to the Mosaic law when He says (Matthew 3:15) “suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.”

In Isaiah 52:15 we read this utterance of the prophet relative to Christ: “and He shall sprinkle many nations.” It was in this book of the Bible that the Eunuch was reading when Philip met him. What words here give him the idea of baptism which he asked of Philip? It must have been this reference of the prophet to Christ to “sprinkle many nations:” also in John 1:25 we hear the Pharisees asking this question of John the Baptist, “Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not



that Christ nor Elias neither that prophet?" Not only then did the Eunuch conceive of the Christian baptism from his reading of Isaiah 52:15, but likewise the Pharisees. In John 1:33, the apostle states, "upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending—the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." We gather from these statements of scriptures that whenever Christ baptized it was by either 'sprinkling' or 'pouring,' and that neither did He baptize nor was He baptized by 'immersion.'

2nd. HOW DID JOHN BAPTIZE? Without drawing the conclusion—which we could very reasonably,—that the mode of Christ's baptism must have been that by which John baptized, let us see what the divine Word has to say on this point. In Luke 1:76, we are told that John "shall be called the Prophet of the Highest." As such then since the law under which he was born, lived and died, not requiring—nor even mentioning—dipping or immersion, he must have practiced either pouring or sprinkling as the mode of his baptism. There being absolutely no record in the Old Testament of a case of purification by 'immersion' why should John now as the prophet of God, introduce another method never ordered by Him? That the significance of baptism in the New Testament circle was purification, and not its mode, is evidenced by a glance at John 3:25-26, with John 4:1, where the Pharisees speak of baptism in connection with its relation to purifying. From Ezekiel 36:25, we learn that this act of purification was accomplished by the "sprinkling of clean water."

Here we see (1) that the Jews of the New Testament expected Christ to 'sprinkle' because they confused John with Him; and (2) that they were baptized by him because they knew it to be in perfect accord with the method of moral cleansing prescribed in the law of Moses—which by the way was the only Bible they possessed—and which had the sanction therefore of God.

It is stated in John 3:23, that John was baptizing in Enod



near Salem because there was “much water there.” The greek word for “much” relates to the gathering together of small streams—and this is the case at the spot where he had gone to baptize. It can signify then ‘many waters’ just as well as ‘much water,’ which all shows, as we noted on a former page, that the mode is not construed from any reading of a few words. Neither does the phrase ‘in Jordan’ give us a sure conclusion for ‘immersion.’ The Greek preposition ‘en’ is translated in the Bible, ‘at’ 100 times and ‘by’ 150 times, so it is evident that this little word cannot be accused of creating all the discussion about the mode of baptism. No! We must conclude that John’s baptism must have been either sprinkling or pouring or else he did not stand related to Christ and the law of the past as the Bible states. If he is to inaugurate a new order, it cannot be by forsaking the past.

3rd. WHAT WAS THE MODE EMPLOYED BY THE APOSTLES AND LEADERS OF THE EARLY CHURCH? It would also be natural for us to conclude that their mode must have been that of John and Christ. We are not satisfied however with this short-cut route, and will again consult the Bible for our answer. We have called your attention to the baptism of the Eunuch by Philip, recorded in Acts 8:38-39. We simply wish to add this note that, the Greek preposition ‘eis’ here rendered ‘into’ is rendered ‘to’ and ‘unto’ six times in this same chapter. There are more than 200 different separate meanings for this small word alone; the same difference of translation also can be noted about the preposition ‘ek’ translated here ‘from.’

Their mode also must have been determined in some measure by the mode of baptism of the Holy Spirit, which occurred on the day of Pentecost. This was promised to the Apostles by Christ (Acts 1:15) just before His departure from them. In Acts 2:16-17, it is related by Peter in his wonderful sermon,—at which time 3000 souls were converted—that this manifestation of the Spirit was in accordance with prophecy. (Joel

2:28, “that it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh etc.)” This pouring Christ called ‘Baptism’ as noted in Acts 1:15. The disciples could hardly have misunderstood the correct mode—if any was to prevail—from these words of the Christ and the prophet.

We are not contending for any one mode, but rather against the claim that baptism is identical and confined in its benefits to the mode of its administration. The Lutheran Church practices ‘sprinkling’ because of its greater consistency and convenience, and not because it rejects immersion.

Then we wish to inquire, How could the 3000 converted on Pentecost have been immersed? How could Paul have been immersed at his baptism, when to this day travelers tell us there is not so much as a bath tub in Demascus? How could the Philipian jailor have been immersed in the jail? There is no positive warrant either in reason or revelation that can dictate the mode of the baptism of these individuals.

Many quote Romans 6:3-4, and Collossians 2:12, as evidence in favor of imersion. What is St. Paul talking about in these verses of scripture? It is **not** the **mode** of baptism **but its benefits**. For it is true that in baptism every man puts on the fruits of Christ’s death and resurrection; otherwise it is no baptism, no matter how much water is used. Then the work by which man comes into these benefits, whereby “he puts on Christ” is not the work of man but of the Holy Spirit. In Galatians 3:27, this conclusion is also evident. It was not the death of the body; neither was it the **physical** putting on of Christ, but the death of sin and consequent **spiritual** putting on of Christ. Neither does the figure used in Romans 6:1-7 indicate the mode of baptism. For if ‘buried with Christ’ refers to the putting of the candidate for baptism under the water, why bring him out again? Then keep in mind the wording of the 3rd verse. It speaks about being ‘baptized into Jesus Christ and into His death’ and the 19th. verse of Colossians 2nd. Chapter: “buried with him in bap-

tism.” Please note that it is not ‘buried in water,’ but ‘in His death’; not ‘with water but’ but ‘with Him.’ The reference of Paul in 1. Cor. 10:1-2, certainly cannot be strained to indicate that baptism is immersion. The Israelites were not immersed in the sea, but went over on the dry land.

### CONCLUSION.

1. That there is no specific mode indicated in the Bible and if any at all, it is sprinkling and pouring.

2. That no necessity faced either Christ or the disciples calling for a plain statement in which the precise mode for baptism would be given. The Old Testament was before them, and while ‘He came not to destroy but to fulfill the law,’ there was no need of instituting another mode for purification than that of sprinkling or pouring as indicated on its pages.

3. By the analogy of scripture it is evident that immersion is indicated nowhere. To seek heathen interpretations is dangerous.

## THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM: ITS SUBJECTS.

Acts 16:14-15—"And a certain woman named Lydia attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." "And when she was Baptized and her household, she besought us, saying if ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come unto my house and abide there. And she contrained us."

As touching the subject of baptism one question yet remains unanswered: it is that which concerns the subjects of baptism. The adult we have seen without question stands in need of baptism in his unregenerate state. There is no quarrel on the necessity of baptism for the one who has come to the years of accountability. It is when we consider the state and necessity of the infant and child that we differ in our conclusions. This question presents a problem to the moral leadership of the church.

With the conception of baptism in mind, 'that its function is to offer, apply, confer and seal divine grace' two questions arise: (1st) Does the child stand in need of divine grace. Is he not already within the circle of that grace? This conclusion arises we are sure either because of a misunderstanding as to the real nature of the child, or from ignorance as to the real attitude of God toward sin. Both have been noted under the study on **sin**, and the conclusion reached was, that the child comes into the world a sinner. Since sin is not an act, simply, but a nature, or a condition, it is easy to see how that baptism would then include the Child.

(2nd.) Does the child possess that by which he can appropriate the benefits of baptism? This calls in question his ability to grasp grace even though offered to him through a means divinely chosen to confer grace. It in short puts the child without the pale of the plan of the present gospel and makes him dependent upon another gospel for his salvation. For it

is evident that the child, as a rational and immortal creature tainted with sin even though not responsible, does stand in need of salvation, and the only question is as to the time and condition for the same.

It is evident then that two things are necessary that baptism may be a real means whereby the individual comes into saved relationship with God: (1) Faith; and (2) Non-resistance. That the child possesses the latter no one will deny. He is not in a position to oppose the offer of God's favor, and stands as a passive vessel before Him. His whole life is open to all kinds of material impressions; it must likewise be open in a larger manner to spiritual ones. If the facts of the earthly can come into his life because of his inability to oppose their entry, why not the entry of the moral facts as well? That the child possesses also faith and is a fit subject for baptism and was considered so by the Church from its beginning to the present we believe to be true.

### THE TESTIMONY OF THE WORD OF GOD.

There are three propositions we must face: First. That the child dying unbaptized is lost. This not only grates on our nerves and creates an emphatic denial, but seems to be most preposterous in view of what we have learned relative to the worth of man and the being of God. If our future state is to depend upon our attitude toward Jesus Christ, then how could He be what He is and still condemn the infant to be lost because he has never had an opportunity to accept Christ as his Savior? No; we believe that God, while making provision for the adult, has also comprehended the infant in His plan. Second. That the child is saved by another gospel, than the one announced by Christ. Paul says in Galatians 1:8, "But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." This is conclusive evidence that the child is included in the present plan of salvation.

Third. That he is to be saved by the gospel of Jesus Christ.



We must go then to this Holy Word to ascertain his place and his qualifications for salvation as outlined by both law and gospel. Divine revelation and sacred history here ought to be the deciding factor and not a psychology, the product many times of an unregenerate mind.

When we state that the child has faith let us keep in mind our definition of faith on a former page. We saw that it was not a mere intellectual assent to a mere statement in the Bible; neither was it the mere acceptance of a historical fact. We saw that it was moral surrender: this is its essential and fundamental significance. That the child has faith after this order can be seen in noting the attitude of any child towards the parent. Take the child in the dark, and with a stranger he will cry: with his mother he feels safe and with his arms around her neck and his head pillowed on her bosom he feels at peace.

Keep in mind that it takes just as much argument to disprove faith in the child, as to prove it. No greater burden rests with the man who accepts the child as having faith, for proof, than with him to reject the same. For if you say 'the child does not have faith,' it is my prerogative to ask that you prove to me that he does not have it.

But then the Bible has spoken on this very point, and above reason we shall gladly place its conclusions. It ought to be the final arbiter and council on any matter that so finally and so vitally affects the interests of the child. In Matthew 18:6, Jesus says, "but whoso shall offend one of these little ones that **believe** in me it were better that a millstone be hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." The disciples had quarreled about their place in the new kingdom. He calls a little child into their midst and sets him up as an example of greatness. It is of this child he is speaking.

Again in this same place, the third verse. He states "ex-



cumcision 'by faith' and since this element qualifies the individual for baptism, he must have had the same in mind in this statement. If the child then was a member of the Church, under the law, why can he not be likewise under the gospel except ye be converted and become as a little child, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." It is evident here that (1st) Jesus recognized the element of faith in the child, and (2nd) that He also recognized him as possessing the qualities by which not only himself but the adult as well must be saved. In other words Jesus states that the child life and quality is the norm of entry into the kingdom.

In Mark 10:13-16, we have the beautiful scene of Jesus blessing the little children. In this scripture we have a most important verse; it is the 15th: "Whosoever shall not **receive the kingdom of God as a little child**, he shall not enter therein." This when analyzed likewise evidences the place of the child life in the economy of God. We now ask, How does the child come into the kingdom? If his method of entry into the favor of God is the basis for the same in the adult, it is most necessary that we find how the child comes into the same. It is urged, that we do not know. But we do know how the adult comes in, and from this we conclude that baptism must also be the way for the child, since the way for both is the same as stated in the above scripture.

And then what is the child, but the potential man? Has it come to pass that our responsibility ends with our fulfillment of duty to the actual, and does not extend to the potential as well? Is this the view that the state, and society in general take of it? Are we excused when we meet only the present needs of the child as a member of government and society? Are we not responsible for his future well-being as well? And is any man able to determine what his possibilities are or what his capacity will develop? If these are matters of mystery in the child life, why do we not accept the verdict of Jesus on the child and his ability to apprehend divine

grace? Why call in question his possession of faith simply because it does not result from the test we have given it in our psychological laboratory? Is our psychology equal to the task of the child nature and child nurture? It certainly cannot be trusted with the child except as based on the divine Word of God.

But we wish again to inquire, whence comes this element by which the child is to apprehend divine favor? Is faith a product of our own making, or does it come from without? Ephesians 2:8, settles this question for us: "For by grace are ye saved through faith and that not of yourselves. **It is the gift of God.**" Now if God must give me faith whereby I who am an adult, am to apprehend the gospel savingly, what stands in the way of His giving the same to the child, who has as yet not come to the time where he can pass judgment on his acts in the light of the gospel? Is it possible that God can extend this gift to me, but not to my child? What limit is there recorded in the Bible—except that of open opposition by men—to God's power to confer this favor on any one? But you cry, Mystery! It is the cry of Nicodemus. But listen to the reply of Christ: "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is **every one**—child or adult—that is born of the Spirit." Paul anticipates this same fact when he says in Romans 9:20, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" No more mystery surrounds the bestowal of grace in infant baptism than prevails in that of the adult.

Then again the place of the child in the new covenant is based upon his place in the Old Testament Church. The male child was circumcised the eighth day or he was cut off. This was in obedience to the covenant made by God with Abraham and recorded in Genesis 17:9-14. In Deuteronomy 29:9 and 15, we again find the place of the child to be fixed within the

Church. That God has made a covenant with infants is beyond question. That circumcision is supplanted in the New Testament Church by baptism, is stated by Paul in Colossians 2:11-12. In Romans 3:30, the apostles speak about the cir- which is a better thing. If he was a part of that which was imperfect and incomplete, why not of that which is perfect and complete?

It is true there is no specific command in the Bible, to baptize children. But we inquire,—in view of the place of the child in the covenant of God—was there any need of any express command on the part of Christ? That children were in the Church by circumcision was known to every Jew and Gentile. If baptism is the new method of entry under the new economy, there was no need for Him to declare a law that had been in force for centuries. Circumcision was the cleansing of the body; baptism the washing of regeneration.

Then again we inquire if the child was a member of the Old Testament Church,—and the Church of God has never been other than one—how was he debarred from membership in the one revealed in Christ? We ask, again, where is it stated that he was no longer to be included in the new covenant perfected in Jesus Christ, and when was it done? Has either the Child or God changed and if not, why is he not a part of the Christian Church as he was of that existing under the promise to Abraham? Is there any place in the Bible—or elsewhere—where the statement is made by which God authorized their expulsion from His Church? Then if not, what right have we, simply because the case does not fit into either our ignorance or studied and man-made machinery, to refuse him a place among the people of God. We answer, not any. Who is it that is offending these little ones but him who is refusing them their rightful place in the Church, through God's appointed means of baptism? The teaching which throws the child out of the Church by refusing to give it baptism, is arbitrary, and unchristian.

Not only have we evidence in the Bible but also in sacred history, that the child was to be baptized. The Church fathers—or preachers of the early Church—have spoken on this point. Origin taught, “that the Church received from the apostle the injunction to give baptism even to infants according to the saying of our Lord concerning infants.” Irenaeus writes, “Christ came to save all: infants, little ones, children, youths, and persons of mature age.”

Justin Martyr states that during his time, “aged persons had been disciples of Jesus from their infancy.”

The word household also carried with it always the evidence of children. In the Syriac New Testament we read Acts 16:15, “she (Lydia) was baptized with her children.” In Acts 16:31, the word ‘house’ is literally translated ‘children.’ Acts 16:33 says, “and was baptized he and all his, straightway.” The next verse states that, “he rejoiced with all his house.” It is plainly evident from these instances in the early Church, that infant baptism was not only practiced but urged by the leaders, who stood separated by only a few years from the Apostles and Christ Himself. In none of the writings of the early Church Fathers, do we find any opposition to infant baptism; whatever difference of opinion did exist was on the ‘time’ of baptism and not on the **practice**.

We are not however contending that the child that dies unbaptized is lost. While we believe that it is the plan of God, fully to include the child within the provisions of His grace, yet where it is withheld from enjoying its benefits,—not because of his own act but of that of another—He will provide for him in the mystery of His own love.

But the responsibility must rest somewhere. It must be on the parent. He is not only responsible for his child to the state and society, but to God as well. Any damage the child makes to property, etc., must be met by the parent. He is obliged to give him an education—despite his opinions about education—and if he is negligent the law sees that he meets

the same in full. The only difference in evidence, is that with the one there is a visible police power and authority; while in the other no such power is evident. The great question then with the parent is not whether your child will be saved or lost if dying unbaptized, but how will **you** be able to meet the great responsibility that is yours in the neglect of this matter. You in a sense are guilty of interfering in the plan of God in behalf of the child, which, even though you be its parent, you have no right whatever to do.

Do not arraign your judgment against the eternal plan of God. It is no small thing when God has indicated on every page of His recorded history with man, both under the prophet and under His Son, His desire and plan for the spiritual nurture of the child, for you to step in and dictate otherwise. If it is your child by natural birth, it is His more by the spiritual birth which He has provided in the gift of His Son. It is time when ignorance, indifference and prejudice should give way to the interests of the child and the full realization of God's plan in and for his life.

### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That the child being born in sin, is a subject of baptism.
2. That the child possesses the two requisites, faith and passivity, for entry into the kingdom of grace.
3. That it is the divine intention that he be a member of the Church through the same avenue as the adult.
4. As a member of the Old Testament Church, he must also be a member of the New Testament Church in the absence of any command of God whereby he is excluded.



## STUDY XVI.

### THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I. Corinthians 10:16—"And the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

In approaching the study of the Lord's Supper we are to contemplate one of the highest, if not the highest, of the mysteries of Christian faith. We are very apt to conceive of it as an isolated event, as a separate act pointing back to a certain part in history, but having neither connection with the past, nor relation with the future. This is not the case, since it is linked, in fact, with the whole history of divine revelation from Adam till now.

The idea of a sacrament is not confined to the few centuries of history that gather around the Christian Church. The idea of a sacramental eating of death is in the history of the first man in the garden of Eden. Two trees of special mention were there: the tree of Life and the tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil. The loss in the garden was the loss of the Sacrament of Life. This was the real paradise lost. The paradise regained, was when Christ sealed, true and valid for man, the promise of God to the woman. It was when He with His own blood proved as sure "that the Bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." If a tree was the center of death in the garden; a tree (the cross) must be the center of **life** on Calvary. As man lost his dominion through the eating of the tree of death in the garden; now to regain that dominion he must eat of this tree of life.

We wish to remind you at this point, that the Symbolical here finds no application, since you will note that it was through the 'tree' that God communicated death: so through



the 'tree of life,' which is Christ, man is to have life. If man fell through disobedience: he must return through obedience.

This is not only the lesson of Eden; it is the eternal law of the Cross. The first sin unto death was man's refusal to follow the letter of God's Word; the first step into eternal life must come when man returns to confidence and accepts that Word. If the act of the first man that alienated him from God was a refusal of His authority over him; His return will come only as he accepts that authority re-emphasized by Jesus Christ.

Standing at the beginning of the new dispensation then we have the new Sacrament of **life**. We shall see also that it can be made the sacrament of Death. At the beginning of the Old Dispensation we had both the Sacrament of death and life. Thus as the Sacrament of the garden was intended to be a channel of divine life; so that of the Lord's Supper. The one brought life, as personal and innocent contact with God; the other brings life in terms of Jesus Christ.

### ITS POWER.

The sacrament of the Holy Supper has not only an earthly but a heavenly side as well. Bread and wine on the one hand; body and blood on the other. Here we are facing some of the greatest thoughts of divine revelation. We are truly treading on Holy Ground. There is in the Lord's Supper; (1) Bread. It is a natural food for man and belongs to all men. Since time began and man to live, bread has stood for life. It is known as the staff of life. Its contribution to the health and well-being of the body is such that we cannot omit this element of food from our consideration. (2) Wine. It is the old symbol of vigor, strength, peace and joy. It stood for a full life. It was Jesus who said "I am the true vine." These constitute the earthly elements. (3) Flesh. It is the basis of life. (4) Blood. This is that life of which the flesh is the basis. In Genesis 9:4, the Jews are commanded not to eat flesh containing blood, since blood was conceived as 'life' or

‘soul.’ This is a result of the extreme reverence for life and out of which grew the practice of eating the body of the sacrifice, but drinking only a symbol for its blood.

The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper however, is not a sacrifice. While it is true that it bears resemblance to it, yet it is not identical. In sacrifice, man offers to God; in a sacrament, God offers to man. To identify them in the Lord’s Supper is to do so at the expense of truth. While it is true we have the elements in the Supper that constitute the sacrifice, yet it is one not offered by man. It was offered by Christ, and through the Holy Supper its benefits are conveyed to the believer. If he stated “this is the New Testament (or covenant) in My Blood,” it was not to **constitute the Supper a sacrifice**, but only to **apply the benefits that come from the sacrifice**, which He Himself was.

In the account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper (Matthew 26:17-30), Jesus speaks of it as ‘the passover.’ Thus He links it together with that great feast of the Jews. It not only carries with it somewhat the significance of this feast, but was instituted at the time of the celebration of the feast in the Holy City. For at this time in Jerusalem was being celebrated this great Passover feast. It commemorated the deliverance of the children of Israel from the hand of the destroying angel (Exodus 12:21-28), and marked a great epoch in their history. It was typical of deliverance and redemption, and it was the wish of Jesus to eat in reality which the other signified in type. As the lamb—the type—was slain according to the instructions of God; so He was to be that lamb which the former typified.

The points in common in these two ‘Passovers’ were (1) at the passover of the Jews a lamb was to be killed: Christ was that lamb. Exodus 12:3 says, “that they shall take to every man a lamb.” It was John the Baptist who cried out to his disciples upon seeing the approach of Jesus, “Behold the lamb of God.” (John 1:29), John the apostle when on the

Isle of Patmos saw, “in the midst of the elders stood a lamb.” He heard the music of heaven and the burden of its song was, ‘Worthy is the Lamb’.”

(2) The lamb was a type of perfection. Christ was truly perfect. “Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot” (I. Peter 1:12).

(3) The slaying of the lamb was a type of redemption. Christ was slain and in truth is that redemption: “Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God—Worthy is the Lamb that was slain” (Rev. 1:6-7).

(4) The Passover symbolized a sacrifice: Christ was that sacrifice (Hebrews 9:14-10; 8-10).

(5) The Paschal Supper was a “natural communion of the type; the Lord’s Supper is a supernatural communion of the substance” (I. Corinthians 10:16).

Here then we conclude that in Christ we have the true Paschal Supper. The Passover of the **old** is supplanted by its fulfillment in the **new**. The institution of the Holy Supper marks this transition and establishes the surety to all mankind to come of His continual presence to faith. If “He was to be with them even unto the end of the world,” this is His chosen means of the presence. If then to feed upon the Paschal Lamb—and by this eating they were assured of divine power—was the grand object of the feast, it is certainly significant that to obtain this same blessing in the Lord’s Supper, we must also eat His flesh and drink His blood. He must have had the Supper in mind—which was not as yet instituted—when He laid down the law of all true life in these words, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink of His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh of My blood hath eternal life” (John 6:53-54).

This brings us to what we believe to be the teaching of the New Testament upon this great Christian feast. No small

amount of discussion has centered around it, and yet we feel sure very few fully realize the scope of its aim neither do many grasp its true import for the soul. We wish to lay down five facts which are true of this sacrament.

**1. That the true body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects.**

**2. That they are truly present in the Lord's Supper.**

**3. That they are truly present under the form of bread and wine.**

**4. That being present under this form they must be possible of communication.**

**5. That thus communicated they are thus received by all partaking of the Lord's Supper.**

(1) By true body, we mean the actual body of Christ, and not an imaginary or an ideal one: "this is my Body, which is given for You." By true blood we mean, that blood which was the true basis of His human life and by which we are redeemed: "this is my blood which is shed for you." The meaning of these words by which Christ institutes the Holy Supper, is "this which I offer to you, which you are one to receive and eat, is not only bread, but it is besides My Body. This which I offer to you and which you are to receive and drink is not only wine, but besides it is my blood." If the norm of teaching on this point is to be the Holy Scriptures rather than the decisions of councils, we are at a loss to know how another meaning can be attached to these words. To depart from the express meaning of the Bible is to turn every part of it into an allegory and without any serious value to us.

(2) By the presence of His true body and blood in the Holy Supper, we mean not an ideal one. It is not a presence that is confined to either memory or even to faith alone. It is neither a sign merely nor a symbol. We mean that Christ as the God-man is substantially present in the Supper, as to both natures.

This is a result of the ability of the human nature to par-

ticipate in the privileges of the divine nature, and since it is possible for the divine to be everywhere, where it wills to be, it is likewise possible for the human nature of Christ, to be everywhere, and hence in the Holy Supper. The presence then of the God-man in the Supper is not a presence, simply to faith, but with Christ actually in the Supper. This means that Christ is not at the right hand of God alone—considered as a place—but can also be present in the Communion, not simply because of our faith that apprehends Him, but because He wills to be so. As the glorified Christ—both human and divine—then can be everywhere, it is not irrational to suppose that He can be likewise in the Supper. Hence His presence is not imaginary but most real.

Then again the elements used by Christ at the institution of the Supper—bread and wine—evidence to the truth of our conclusion touching His real presence in the Supper. The one was to be eaten and the other drunk. No significance would result to this act if we rob these elements of this quality when identified with the body and blood of Christ. It is a wonderful analogy and yet wonderfully true, that by identifying His body and blood with the bread and wine the former participates in the office of the latter. If the one was to be eaten and drank, then the other must be.

This is confirmed again by what Jesus called this New Sacrament; it was **a supper**. Can we imagine any man having a supper simply with symbolical and imaginary bread and wine? Or for that on anything not real? The very idea carries with it the other idea of eating that which was real and substantial. And then it is the Lord's Supper. It is hardly probable that when He said, "take eat this is My body, take drink this is My blood," that he intended that they should be eating and drinking that which did not actually exist. To say otherwise, amounts almost to an indictment of the motives, which led Christ to use these particular words.

Then it is in the form of a will or testament. It was His



last bequest to those whom He had chosen to be the leaders of the Church of which He was to be the cornerstone. He had assured them of His continual presence in their midst, upon many occasions, and this sacrament as we noted before, was the precise fulfillment of that promise. As such then, we cannot stretch the imagination to conceive of this act other than a willing to them of His real body and blood instead of an imaginary body and blood. And then what value would such a presence have for the Church? In many Churches today where this view prevails, we see its logic. Its meaning and import has degenerated into nothing more than a mere sham, and the Supper is neglected for other things. As men made light of the wedding feast of the King, so now do they make light of this feast of the King of kings. This interpretation which reduces the Supper into a mere display rather than a real communion, cheapens the gift of Christ and robs faith of its proper object. If His body and blood are the organs of His deity, then when He gives these in the Supper, He gives everything.

Again man enters, in the Holy Supper, into covenant relation with God. The old covenant had been broken; this was the sealing of the new. But not so if the basis of this covenant and sealing is only sign and symbol. If the Lord's Supper does not bring to us the real Christ; if His presence here is not real, then why "Take—eat—take—drink." Why—if it is only the taking of a symbol—need there be any "eating and drinking?" Why not expose to public view the elements of the Supper at stated times? Or better still, display on the walls of the sanctuary a picture of the dying Christ? If we are looking for convenience and the modern order why trouble ourselves about any 'eating and drinking' at all?

This procedure however is not without its witness in our day. Some Churches realizing the consistency of the "sign or symbol" theory of the Lord's Supper, have displayed over



the altar a painting revealing the sufferings and death of Christ whose significance is called to the mind by the pastor at stated times. Other sects in their haste to what they call moral simplicity, discard the sacrament altogether. But then what about the command of Christ “to take eat”—“take drink?”

It is true that He says “this do in remembrance of Me.” We need however, to take note of only two facts to explain its meaning: (1) This statement is confined to the record of only one of the gospel writers—St. Luke; and (2) it is admitted by good authority, that it is not found in the older manuscripts, which take us close to the time of the institution of the Supper. But then how could any one receive in the Supper the body and blood of Christ, without at the same time remembering Him in His life and death? This matter of ‘remembrance,’ then is not an essential, but only a mere incidental matter. The significance then behind this Holy feast is vastly more than that implied in this mental act. Its import for man is altogether and positively spiritual. In it he receives something more than a mere memory of Christ: he receives Christ Himself. Any other conclusion does not accord consistently with what we feel could be the intent of Christ, and what would be His supreme motive in instituting this Supper which bears His name.

(3) In stating the presence of Christ in the Supper, to be under the form of bread and wine, we do not mean to state that His body and blood in any manner become mixed up with the bread and wine. This is what is known as consubstantiation. Neither do we mean to state that the bread and wine, and the body and blood, become identical in the participation of the Supper. That is, that the bread turns into the veritable body, and the wine into the veritable blood, of Christ. This doctrine we repudiate equally as well as we do that just mentioned. This is the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Hence they deny the wine in the Communion to the laity since they

do not want any of the blood of Christ to be wasted. They justify this teaching by stating that since the 'bread' turns into the 'body' of Christ, and hence contains the blood, it is not necessary to drink of the wine, since in the eating of the 'bread' the blood is likewise taken. But we answer that Christ said, "drink ye all of it." Also when He offered the wine He said, "this is My blood." When He offered the 'bread,' He simply said, "this is My body," the very explanation you see becomes the greatest argument against it.

This turning of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ takes place—according to their teaching—at the time of their consecration. We declare however, that the true body and blood are present in the Supper, **in, with, and under**, the form of bread and wine. We declare "that the Holy Sacrament of the Altar is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, instituted and commanded by the Word of Christ to be eaten and drunk by us Christians." That is, that the bread and wine are channels whereby the body and blood of Christ are communicated to us (I. Cor. 10:16-17). This does not then mean that they are either mixed in some manner or that they are identical in the Supper. The bread remains bread and the wine remains wine, but through these elements Christ as human and divine communicates Himself to us in the Holy Supper.

This truth is emphasized when we again view the sacramental character of the tree of life in the garden of Eden. This tree was by divine appointment the channel of life: the other, the tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil, was the channel of death. Life was, in, through and under the one; death, in, through and under the other. It was for this reason that man was expelled from the garden after his fall. For Him to have remained and to have tasted also of the tree of life in his fallen state would be to perpetuate the condition forever, into which he had fallen. The only way open then

for man's return was through a means consistent with his moral condition and his relationship with God.

(4) That the body and blood being present in the Supper, they must possess the qualities of communication. The apostle Paul states, "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the **communion** of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the **communion** of the body of Christ? (I. Cor. 10:16-17). This we believe to be the true intent of the Lord's Supper. The Epistles are the great interpreters of the Gospels, and certainly here Paul is carrying out this idea. It is his conception of the real significance of the Holy Supper. Here we find his statement, not only as to what constitutes the real elements in the Supper but also their sacramental union, as well. We are well aware that this comes in conflict with many purely natural notions about the true office of the sacrament in hand. Some men say that it is the Holy Spirit which communicates the body of Christ; Paul states that it is the 'bread.' Some men state that the blood of Christ is communicated by the Holy Spirit; Paul says it is communicated by the 'wine.' It is because of this value that men of all times have spoken of the Lord's Supper as 'The Communion,' thus witnessing with the heart what the head many times has refused to say.

(5) That the body and blood of Christ are communicated to all who participate in the supper. This means, that all men who partake of the bread and wine in the Holy Communion receive the same thing irrespective of their moral ability to apprehend it.

Faith then is not a pre-requisite to a reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. There is this distinction however: to the man of faith, this reception makes for his salvation; to the man of unbelief it makes for his damnation. This is so, since faith is the receptive and appropriating agency. Christ is sacramentally present to the one for salvation because of his personal appropriation of His benefits; to

the other, He is present to eternal death—not actively but passively—since the individual is unable because of a lack of faith, to make his own that which makes for eternal life. The Apostle Paul recognizes this element when he speaks about some “eating and drinking damnation to their souls, not being able to discern the body of the Lord” (I. Cor. 11:29). If the man of unbelief as well as the man of faith, did not receive the same when participating in the Supper, the idea of ‘eating and drinking unworthily’ and hence that of ‘damnation’ would be impossible. Faith does not put Christ in the Supper; it simply discerns and appropriates Him.

The Holy Sacrament is not the privilege of a few. It has been instituted to comfort and strengthen all who confess their sins and who still thirst after righteousness. “The Lord’s Supper was instituted for all believers who have been baptized and are able to observe it according to His command.” Who then is worthy to come to the Lord’s table? We answer not the man of self-righteous spirit; neither the man who is impenitent. It is he who knows himself a sinner and who repents and asks God’s pardon. It is the man then who recognizes his absolute dependence upon God for cleansing and subsequent strength. He is worthy who believes the words “given and shed for you for the remission of sins.” This worthiness is not of ourselves, but it comes because of the free gift of God.

But if its power lies specifically in what constitutes the real nature and design of the Holy Supper, this must in some manner be displayed in the results claimed for it. Jesus states that the blood present in the Supper is the same that was shed on the Cross, by which we have remission of sins (Matthew 26:28). The aim of the Supper and one of its immediate results then is to seal this forgiveness for us. In it we have the assurance that His promise is true and sure.

Here we have the great difference between the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper. The former is that of

‘invitation.’ The latter that of ‘confirmation.’ The aim of the former is to start us in the new life; that of the latter to keep us in the new life.

It is here then at this table that the young for the first time enter into the real benefits that flow from the Cross. Being baptized in their infancy and instructed in the pure Word of God, they have come into the Church—not by chance—but by the Biblical method of confirmation, and now for the first time stand within the holy precincts of this new life, as Christians. It is most fitting then that they should again renounce the devil and all his ways, by a confession sealed in the Holy Supper.

### ITS PREPARATION.

With such a high and lofty conception of this sacred Supper, it is only reasonable to suppose that this element would be necessary. If our eating and drinking here has such far-reaching and eternal moral value, it behooves us to make careful preparation before coming to the same. We are admonished, “that if any man hunger, let him eat at home.” This Holy Supper is not a common meal. Man is urged to examine himself and “so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup” (I. Cor. 11:28). It is for this reason that many who should be strong in the power of God, are mere babies, weak and puny. If we prejudge ourselves we shall not be judged of the Lord. “Self-examination is a diligent inquiry into the reality of our repentance, faith and holy living.” This is not only necessary from what we know of the character of the Lord’s Supper, but also from the express commands of God’s word.

It is for this reason that the Lutheran Church has its beautiful service of **public** confession and absolution. It is called the Preparatory Service. It differs very greatly from the confessional of the Roman Catholic Church. In the first service, the confession is made open and in public; in the latter



one it is made in private—in the ears of a priest. In the former service it is made to God; in the latter it is made to a human individual.

This service should be held each time before partaking of the Holy Supper, which should be often—we should say at least four times every year. We do not however favor the custom of weekly communion, as it tends to cheapen and make common, the Holy Sacrament.

No man can neglect this Holy Sacrament without bringing shame to his Christ. To make light of it is to block our entrance to the kingdom of God, for in so doing we cast reproach upon Him who instituted it. It is to crucify Him afresh and bring Him to an open shame and rebuke before the world. In this feast He is not only your present friend, but the guarantee of your future.

#### CONCLUSION.

1. That in the Lord's Supper we have the true presence of the body and blood of Christ communicated through bread and wine as channels.

2. That it is this true body and blood that we receive when at His table.

3. That in the Holy Supper, forgiveness is sealed to us.

4. That confession of sin should be made to God in preparation, before we present ourselves at the Lord's table.

5. That all men who eat of the Supper irrespective of their faith, receive the 'body and blood' of Christ, but with not the same moral result in both.



## STUDY XVII.

### THE DOCTRINE OF LAST THINGS.

Hebrews 9:27—"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

It is most fitting that we should conclude these studies by an investigation into the witness of Holy Scripture upon those things that shall prevail when our earthly existence is at an end. We saw that man is a moral spirit, possessing a rational soul. That as such, he was not built for this span of a few years; his horizon does not end with the grave but on the contrary touches the very shores of eternity itself. He is a creature whose outlook is not bound by the exigencies of time, but by the realities of immortality. It is natural then for us to want to lift the curtain of divine revelation and see what is in store for us in that land across the grave. It is not necessary to first prove that man will live on the other side of the grave. Not only does reason set up proofs sufficient and beyond question, but the Scriptures as well. It everywhere reckons with man as a creature with a future after death. Its whole economy is built upon this assumption; it assumes this as a fact. For if man is not immortal, then why the revelation of God in any shape or form? We may ask further why any God at all? It is our desire to consider the events at the end of life in the manner in which the Bible represents them to be, and we see at the head of the list:

#### DEATH.

This is a common heritage of all men. No man can escape it. It lurks everywhere and is no respecter of persons. It is the withdrawal of the basis of life, the soul. It is called by different names: "a gathering unto their people" (Genesis 25:8-17); "a departure in peace" (Luke 2:29); "a sleep" (Matthew 9:24). It stands as an eternal testimony to the

awful catastrophe in the garden of Eden when our first parents fell from their high estate and brought death—both physical and spiritual—upon the race (Romans 5:12).

Three causes are recognized in the Bible as the reason for death in the history of man. (1) The malice of the devil in leading man astray. (2) The guilt of man in continual sinning. (3) The wrath of God upon his sin. It is to be believed that had not man sinned, and fallen from the presence of God, he would have been translated into heavenly happiness at the completion of this earthly life, without death. But because he sinned death has come upon all, and even though Christ has died for us and made possible the joys of a blessed life after death, yet death is the way of all flesh since all flesh is sinful. This is the awful pathos of human life.

At death, the body goes back to the earth from which it has come but the soul to God for judgment. It survives the dissolution of the body and begins an existence quite peculiar and all its own. Before death there is a mutual interchange of feelings between the soul and the body; but at death this ceases—the firm bond is broken. Where once the body shared the sufferings of the soul; now it must share them alone. The soul now no longer acts through the body as an instrument but lives and subsists apart from it.

The condition of the soul after death then is conditioned by its moral condition here. It will be happy or in misery, in the future as it has embraced salvation afforded in Jesus Christ. It is man's attitude toward Him that shall determine the character of his final estate. He is the measure of man's destiny and of his happiness in that future world.

But another question arises here, 'What is the condition of the soul between the time of physical death and the resurrection of the body? Is it a state of sleep, and insensibility? Does man go immediately into the personal—as over against the moral—presence of his Christ? Or is there an intermediate place of habitation for all souls?

Our conception of this matter is that there is an intermediate state of the soul. By this we mean that there is a 'where' somewhere between the time of death and the resurrection of the body—which we shall learn occurs at the final judgment—where the souls of the pious dead dwell. Our proof for this is (1st.) REASON. That which puts us in perfect communication with this physical world is the fact that we have a physical body. To the extent that this body is perfect, will our touch with the world be perfect, showing that it is our body that puts us in correspondence with the world in which we live. Man as a spirit could not without a medium of communication live in the world and be consistent with its life. This being true with man and this physical world, if he must have a body that corresponds with the world in which he lives that he may live in harmony with it, then by analogy he must have a body in which he is to live, if he is to be in perfect harmony with the new world which he does at death. This is anticipated by the scriptures which teach the resurrection of the body fitted as a temple for the redeemed soul of man. Man is not fitted to dwell in that ideal world at death. He does not possess the true medium of communication, otherwise why need a body at all and what reason for the resurrection of the body. We see in this economy more than a mere mystery. It is one determined by the character of the soul and of the world in which it is to live forever.

(2). REVELATION. The word of Jesus to the dying thief on the cross was, "today thou shalt be with me in Paradise." While we are aware of the oriental setting of this word, yet we wish to inquire, Was this an imaginary place? Was it a place that had no existence? When Jesus used this word, in giving comfort to the thief, did it have any meaning on his lips? Was Jesus holding out to the sufferer who was begging for mercy, only a figure of speech that had no reality in fact? We cannot imagine such a state or attitude of Christ toward the thief. If it was to have any comfort for him, it must

mean something. We cannot conclude that Jesus was 'fooling' the thief into peace.

We do not mean to state that the soul is asleep, for this we do not conceive to be true. We do wish however to state, that we believe the soul to be active and enjoying the presence of Christ, in a degree not possible here. But as to the ideal and personal presence of Christ, we do not think this possible for the soul, before the final resurrection when it will be reunited with its glorified body. Neither do we imply a certain kind of Purgatory, as do the Roman Catholics. Their purgatory is a state of preparation. We conceive of the state of the pious dead as fixed and settled forever. They assert the existence of five places for the future of the soul: 1. Hell, 2. Purgatory, 3. Limbus puerorum—where the souls of unbaptized infants go, 4. Limbus Patrum—the abode of the saints of the Old Testament, 5. Heaven, three of which we must positively eliminate on grounds both of reason and revelation.

### THE RESURRECTION.

As the soul of man survives after death, so also the body which will again be restored to life. This is most evident from the pages of Scripture, (Isaiah 26:18, Daniel 12:2, John 5:28; 11:23, 1. Cor. 15:12) and from what we know of the relation of the soul to the new world. It is to revelation that we must go for this fact of the Resurrection, and not to reason. Reason would deny not only this fact, but all others which transcend the range of the physical senses. To conceive of how the body that had been placed in the tomb and long ago reduced to ashes, or perhaps shattered to the winds or perhaps dissolved by the waters of the sea, can be gathered together and reunited with the soul, is a staggering blow to reason. Had God's Word been silent on this fact, we do not believe that it would be a part of man's outlook upon the great undiscovered world beyond the grave.

This is the testimony of the divine Word: that every particle of the body wherever found, will be collected together and made the dwelling place for the redeemed and glorified soul. (Romans 8:11.; 1. Cor. 15:53.; 2. Cor. 5:4, Philipians 3:21) The body then, that shall arise will be one endowed with new qualities. These attributes shall give it an endless existence, without need of support or nourishment. It shall be free indeed to progress in that eternal likeness of Him, whose presence and glory shall be heaven and eternal joy. In other words the body of the resurrected will be spiritual and not natural; immortal and not mortal; incorruptible and not corruptible. (John 5:28-29, 1. Cor. 15:42-44).

The resurrection is a direct result of the merits of the death and resurrection of Christ. It is through Him that we shall be reunited with our bodies. He is the first fruits of those that slept. This is specifically true of the pious dead. The bodies of the lost which will share in the resurrection fact, come forth more particularly because of Jesus as King; not as a mediator, but as a Judge. The true end of the resurrection is to be found in its relation to the saved and not the lost.

### THE FINAL JUDGMENT.

We might say that there are three judgments in the history of a man: that which is present in this life—for every act is judged; that which takes place automatically at death—for “as the tree falleth so shall it lie;” and that which shall characterize the final consummation of all things. It is the last one with which we have to do at present. This comes after the resurrection of the dead, (1. Thess. 4:16) and will terminate the career of the earth and of earthly things. It will be characterized by (1) a manifestation of divine glory, which will display the justice and mercy of God. This life has witnessed many inequalities—the wicked prosper and the good suffer and are poor—but at this time they shall receive



justice at the hand of Him who knoweth all things and who knows not from the outside but from the heart. (2). The complete glorification of Christ. (Hebrews 2:8, Matthew 25:31). On the cross He was put to death as a malfactor and numbered with the transgressors, but now He triumphs completely over all His foes and is victor over hell, death, and the grave. (3). The exaltation to power of all the godly. In this life they suffer, are afflicted and punished by men. Then they shall be crowned by God as victors. If their life has been one of affliction we are told it shall not compare with the eternal glory that shall be revealed in the last day. (4). The completion of rewards and punishments. While we speak of this day as the 'Judgment', it is not that God will act as the judge, "For the Father Judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. "(John 5:22) Jesus Christ is to be the judge, and at the appointed time—which is known to no one except the Father—He will appear for this office. (Acts 17:31) This judgment will include not only men but angels. (2. Cor. 5:10) It will comprehend the devil and his angels who fell from their high position in heaven, (Jude 1:6) and are now reserved to that day.

While it is true that no one knows the exact time of His coming for judgment, the Scripture has indicated some marks of the times which will be near the end. These are, the mutiplication of heresies; seditions (Matthew 24:5) throughout (Mark 24: 6-5) the entire world; dreadful persecution of the godly (Matthew 24:9, Mark 13:9); the prevalence of open and defiant wickedness; (Luke 17:28-30; 19:8) the universal preaching of the gospel throughout the world. Matthew 24:14, Malachi 4:2) Some teach the coming of Christ for a visible reign before the final judgment, for the establishment of a kingdom on earth under the control of the elect for 1000 years. This is not generally accepted but rather that the second advent of Christ, the general resurrection, the final judgment and the end of the world are immediately united



and the one follows the other without any interval of time. His kingdom is not of an earthly character; it is to be supremely moral or spiritual.

### THE END OF THE WORLD.

After the final judgment we are told the world will be destroyed by fire. (2. Peter 3:12) the method and process, man is however not able to understand. This is reserved by God within His own councils. If He made the world out of nothing, it is to this state that it shall be reduced. It will not be a mere transformation or change of form in the world merely but a total annihilation of its substance. (Luke 21:33: Rev. 20:11).

### ETERNAL DEATH FOR THE LOST AND ETERNAL LIFE FOR THE SAVED.

The former are given over to eternal punishment and the latter to everlasting joy. It will mean the separation forever of the Good and the Bad. These moral conditions are represented in the Bible by places: heaven and hell. They represent the final abode of the saved and the lost.

What is heaven? It is life in the presence of God, free from evil, and full of good. It is companionship with Him whom we recognize as our Creator and whom we worship as our Father and our God. Eternal life is not so much length of years, as it is quality of life. It is not a life extending over countless millenniums, but a life which is intensive in its moral quality of goodness. It is worthiness to stand in the presence of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (Matthew 25:34-40).

What is Hell? This is an unpleasant word to many. We do not like to speak it. But it is a conception that has prevailed in all ages and among all peoples. From the history of the man of India, down through the Egyptian, the Babylonian, and the Persian, some conception of a place of final pun-

ishment has been evident. It seems to have been a matter of the moral consciousness of all men of all time.

Its place then in the Bible is not surprising, in view of the revelation of Christ. Since it has been a matter of concern with all men, its fuller disclosure would be expected in the Bible and instead of attempting to read it out of its teaching, it would be better to more clearly understand it and its condition.

This is particularly true of that of the New Testament. Here the word used is 'gehenna'. Outside of Jerusalem in the days of Jewish heathendom—that is when they had fallen from the worship of the true God and were worshipping idols—there was in the valley of Hinnon, an idol called by the name of the valley, into which the Jewish mothers cast their babes, to be burned as a sacrifice. From this the New Testament writers drew their word for hell and it has in moral value the significance, which the idol had for the physical.

(Matthew 5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 23:25:46) Not one of these statements speak of a provisional hell. There is not even the mere sign of anything like probation after death. They all speak with a note of finality that carries with it the thought of divine authority. Neither is there any thought even intimated of either restoration or of annihilation.

This is true from what we learned of the nature of SIN. It is not an act, neither is it many acts: it is a nature. The great question then is not what does God impose upon me, but what am I taking with me into that other world? For be it remembered that hell was not provided for men, but for the devil and his angels. (Matthew 25:41) If man chooses to companion with the class of spirits whose end is so awful, how can he blame God for his condition? Man then in this sense makes his own hell, but it is a hell with moral import and whose destiny is fixed and final.

To fix the blame then on God is to fail to remember what sort of creature you are. You are not a machine but a man;

a being possessed of a spirit and possessing moral qualities that when destroyed and abused, make hell inevitable. Hell is not a place then fixed by an angry God in which to vent His displeasure upon whom He will. It is the creation of sin primarily and only so far as you allow yourself to share in its destiny will you fall under the displeasure of God. Man's punishment then is self-afflicted.

Penalty then is not something imposed upon man by God; it is an inherent result of sin. To think then that either God will at sometime after death restore the soul, that has sinned, to rightful relations with Him, or that after the end of the world the souls of men will be annihilated, is not only preposterous but the child of the devil. It is a position that is fostered and produced by that evil one who seduced our first parents into the calamity that has now befallen the entire race. It is evidence of gross ignorance both as to the true nature of sin and likewise as to the nature of both God and man.

It is true that God is Love, but He is first holy and righteous. Love is His holiness defending itself. This is not however the question. The one that does concern us however is **what kind of a creature must it be that can sin in the face of so great love?** It is not what must be the nature of a god who can see his creatures lost forever, but what must be the **moral** condition of the creature who can see all that **love** has done for Him and yet continually spurn its offers of grace and strength? If the choice of eternal life lies with man; the choice of eternal death must likewise rest with him.

Hell then is not a mere external provision, but a moral result. It is not a mere place of punishment either; it is this because of what it implies. Hell is the eternal consciousness of an eternal banishment from the presence of God. It is the anguish of one eternally, who feels the way to the presence of Him, in whose image he was made and whose nature he shares, forever blocked and sealed against him, by a nature fixed by

acts of his own choice. If you find the idea of a literal hell fire revolting, do not think that the awful burning of conscience will be any less in its intensity of suffering. To change the name is not to change the character. To state moral results in more cultured and polite terms is not to change their final import for the soul.

Neither is the result effected by your belief or disbelief in the character of hell. The child did not believe the gun was loaded, but this disbelief did not effect the result which was his death. The Word of God is responsible for the revelation of this truth and its voice is final and authority for all men for all time. The efforts to argue it from its place, by words and sentences, may prove somewhat satisfactory and bring a degree of peace for the present, but the inevitable is destined to come, if God and man are what we know them to be.

Two questions naturally suggest themselves: (1st). Whether the saints will recognize each other in the life to come? We answer emphatically: **yes**, since that image that was ruined by sin, has been restored, and in perfect knowledge man will consider the facts of his new environment. (2nd). Will the joy of eternal life be clouded by the fact that the blessed will see their former friends and relatives tortured in hell? To this we answer emphatically: **No**. The absorbing fact for them will be the glory and presence of God and their will, will be in perfect harmony with His. Our medium of sight will not be the mortal imperfections of the flesh, but the moral perfections of the glorified man. Our affections then will not be carnal, but spiritual and will extend only to those who are beloved of God and whom He has made heirs of eternal life. These same questions however applied to the condition of the lost, will have the effect of the consciousness of the man who realized the quality of the prize he lost through his disobedience, and which he will be compelled to admire and praise eternally. If the knowledge of the place made vacant by the departure of a loved one brings sorrow and anguish of heart,

how much more will that which realizes for the individual the value of the moral void in the soul, made possible by the expulsion of God from its life? We estimate the former through the medium of a beclouded intelligence. Sin prevents us from properly realizing the meaning of the departure of a loved one. But our estimation and consequent knowledge of the latter is based upon a standard that rests in the light of eternal, unrestricted revelation.

### CONCLUSION.

1. That death is a reality in the history of man.
2. That at the second coming of Jesus Christ, the resurrection of all dead and the translation of the bodies of all living at the time will take place.
3. At this time all shall be judged by Christ, according to their attitude toward Him.
4. That the righteous will enter into life eternal: the lost into a place of final punishment.
5. That the final abode of the lost is fixed and is the result of man's attitude of friendship with sin.
6. That Hell is a reality and to be accepted in the New Testament sense.



## APENDIX A.

### THE APOSTLE'S CREED.

1. Peter 3:15—"But sanctify the Lord God in your heart and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear."

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Christian Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of sins; the Resurrection of the body; and the Life everlasting. Amen.

This is the briefest and perhaps the oldest of the Ecumenical—or universally accepted—creeds. It is called the 'Apostles Creed,' because it represents a concise form and summary of what they believed and taught. Its name then indicates not authorship but doctrine. The date of its writing is placed anywhere from 250 A. D. to 460 A. D. at Rome. The above form is the one in general use among Christian churches.

There are two variations, however from this form: 1st. Instead of saying "He descended into Hell," some say that "He descended into the place of departed spirits." The former is the correct one, both from the original form of the creed, and as to its doctrinal value. The one designates a specific place peopled with souls of a certain moral character; the other is vague and indefinite. 2nd. Others change the phrase "in the Holy Catholic Church" to read "In the Holy Christian



Church.” The former form is the correct one and was displaced by the other form in the interests of harmony. Owing to the misunderstanding of the word ‘Catholic,’—which means ‘universal’—the word ‘Christian’ was inserted in its stead.

But the question arises, Why any creed at all? We are told that the Bible is our creed. The Bible is **not** a creed and cannot be in any sense of that term. The word ‘Creed’ comes from the latin word ‘Credo,’ which means. “I believe.” It is a short statement then of belief. As a statement then of Christian faith or belief, its basis must be the Bible. This being the case how then can the Bible be any man’s creed? The very idea is ridiculous and absurd, and must have its nativity either in the land of gross ignorance or of prejudice. It evidences neither a mark of religious culture nor an intelligent touch with history. The creed is a result of a struggle: it is a landmark of a moral battle. The Apostles Creed was beyond doubt founded on the baptismal formula, as an answer to the enemies of the early church. The Nicean Creed formulated in 325 A.D. was an answer against one of the most destructive heresies of all history—Arianism. Had not the defenders of the “faith once delivered unto the saints”, formulated these statements of Christian Faith, we beyond doubt would have neither Christ to preach nor Bible to read.

The creed is nowhere in Protestantism given a place above the Bible. It is always considered as having a subordinate, and nowhere a superior place; for a creed is simply a statement of what the Church conceives the Bible to teach upon the fundamental truths within it. It is the platform of the Church setting forth her attitude toward, as well as her conviction on, the great questions with which it has to do. If a platform—or a creed—is not only expedient but necessary for social and political propaganda, why should it not be for spiritual propaganda as well? The creed does not then supplant the Bible any more than a political platform supplants

government. As the latter interprets government, so the former interprets the Bible. The province of the creed is to be a defense of the Bible and to give it power in the hands of man.

Then again a creed is necessary to the stability and life of the Church. Many minds looking at the Bible—now through their weakness, now through their strength—arrive at many conclusions. The difficulty is not with the Bible—its measure is ever the same—but with the mind, etc., of man who attempts to understand it. Here is a mind that has a special adaptation for delving into the deep things of God. His conclusions from estimating divine truth are quite different from the man who has no aptitude in this direction at all. The finer and deeper meanings of truth and of their application to the needs of the soul, to the one man are clear and distinct; to the other they are unreal and vague. The creed then is a bulwark of strength for the Church against heresy and unbelief and no man who knows its significance will deny it a place in the Christian programme.

## APPENDIX B.

Psalms 119:97—"O how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day."

There are three kinds of law spoken of in the Bible, (1) Civil, (2) Ceremonial, (3) Moral: The latter alone is binding on all men. God gave this law through:

### THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

I. I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

II. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.

III. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.

Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

IV. Honor thy father and thy mother, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

V. Thou shalt not kill.

VI. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

VII. Thou shalt not steal.

VIII. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

IX. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.

X. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maid-servant, nor his cattle, nor anything that is his.

Some of the names by which the Ten Commandments are known are 'The Law;' the Decalog—or the 10 words; and the tables of the Covenant. They are written by the finger of God on two tables of stone on Mt. Sinai (Exodus 20:2-17), and delivered as an independent code of laws to Moses for the people of Israel.

As to the division of the decalog, Churches differ somewhat. This does not however effect the meaning, but only the arrangement. Some combine the ninth and tenth commandments and divide the first one into two. Others among which is the Lutheran, state them in the above form which is the more historically true.

I. This Commandment teaches, that "We should fear, love and trust God above all things."

II. This Commandment teaches, that "we should fear and love God and not curse, swear, conjure, lie or deceive by His name: but call upon His name in every time of need, and worship Him with prayer praises and thanksgiving."

III. This Commandment teaches, that "we should fear and love God, and not despise preaching and His word, but gladly hear and learn it." 'Sabbath means rest.' You keep the

first day of the week holy and sacred as the Sabbath because, (1) Jesus arose on this day; (2) Also on this day He frequently appeared to His disciples after His resurrection; (3) and on this day the Holy Spirit was poured out on the Apostles (on the day of Pentecost); (4) the Apostles kept this day for worship: and they must have known their Lord's will.

IV. This Commandment teaches, that "we should love and fear God and not despise our parents and superiors, not provoke them to anger, but honor, serve, love and esteem them." It is the first commandment with a promise.

V. This Commandment teaches, that "we should love and fear God, and not hurt nor harm our neighbor in his body, but help and befriend him in every bodily need." This commandment is broken when, (1) We maliciously take the life of another; (2) when we maliciously use our influence and authority to secure the death of another; (3) by influencing others to form habits that ruin health and shorten life; (4) by harboring malice or revenge; (5) by taking one's own life. Life may be taken in the following ways without breaking this commandment: (1) In self defence; (2) in the public defence; (3) in executing a judicial sentence; (4) by unavoidable accident.

VI. This Commandment teaches, that "we should fear and love God and live chaste and pure in words and deeds, and husband and wife each love and honor the other." This commandment forbids, adultery and all kinds of impure thoughts, words and acts. It requires us "to cultivate pure thoughts, pure words and pure deeds" (Matthew 19:5-6).

VII. This Commandment teaches, that "we should fear and love God and not take our neighbor's money or property, nor get it by false dealing, but help him to improve and protect his property and living." This commandment is broken: "(1) In theft or dishonesty; (2) by unfair dealing or fraud, by which another's property is brought into our possession

without his consent or a just equivalent.” It forbids likewise hording, and enjoins giving to God.

VIII. This Commandment teaches, that “we should fear and love God and not falsely belie, betray, and backbite, nor slander our neighbor, but excuse him, speak well of him and put the best construction on all he does” (Ephesians 4:25, James 4:11, Psalms 34:12).

IX. This Commandment teaches, that “we should fear and love God, and not craftily seek to gain our neighbor’s inheritance or home, nor get it by a show of right, but help and serve him in keeping it” (Luke 7:15).

X. This Commandment teaches, that “we should fear and love God, and not estrange, force or entice away from our neighbor his wife, servants, cattle but urge them to stay.” This commandment forbids “evil designs upon our neighbor’s family or property. It requires “us so to love our neighbor as to help him maintain the happiness and prosperity of his household.”

A. “Has man ever kept God’s commandments? No.” “We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God” (Ecclesiastes 7:20).

B. “What will enable us to keep God’s commandments?” “To keep the commandments of God, we need a new heart” (Psalms 51:10).



## APPENDIX C.

### TWO DOZEN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON LUTHERANISM.

1. What is the origin of the Evangelical Lutheran Church?  
(A). Historically: it dates back to the launching of the Reformation under Dr. Martin Luther in 1517. As to its teaching, it dates back to the time of the Apostles. Luther simply restored the Church of the New Testament,
2. Why called the 'Evangelical Lutheran' Church? (A). As the regenerated Church, it bears the name of its founder. (B). As Evangelical, it stands firmly upon the Gospel, both in preaching and practice.
3. When and where was Dr. Luther born? (A). He was born at Eisleben, Germany, November 10, 1483.
4. In what Church was he reared? (A). In the Roman Catholic Church.
5. Why did he leave the Roman Catholic Church? (A). He severed his relations with that Church because of its corruption and false teaching within. Upon a mission to Rome, Luther saw the lack of real religion in his Church and determined to correct the abuses from within. He soon saw this was impossible, so withdrew.  
The Roman Catholics allege that it was because he was desirous of getting married. No greater lie was ever perpetrated. No other answer on their part can be given by the Roman Catholic priests since they wish to cover up to their people, the real cause, well attested even in secular history.
6. What are the fundamental principles of the Reformation?

1. The supremacy of the Word of God in all matters of faith and practice. It is the final source of appeal.
2. Justification by faith.
3. The universal priesthood of all believers. A mere glance only at these principles is needed to convince any one that the Lutheran Church is the very opposite of the Roman Church.
7. What event marked the opening of the Reformation? (A). The nailing of the ninety-five theses—or propositions—upon the Castle Church, at Wittenberg, October 31, 1517.
8. When and where was the word ‘Protestant’ first applied to Christians? (A). In 1529, at the Diet—or council—of Spires. It was used as a nick-name against those who protested against the teachings of the Church of Rome.
9. What one charge in particular did Luther bring against the Roman Catholic Church? (A). That of selling indulgences. The pope was building the great Church of St. Peter at Rome and to induce people to contribute of their money he sent men throughout the land selling what is known in history as ‘indulgences.’ These were papers given upon the payment of a certain amount of money which either forgave their sins for a certain length of time or procured their release altogether. An indulgence is a bargain or promise, whereby, upon the payment of a certain amount of money the individual received full pardon from the penalty of sin, or secured the release of a soul from the flames of Purgatory. It was this blasphemy that incensed Luther and made him cry out against it.
10. What other great events marked the life of Dr. Luther? (A). 1. His stand at the Diet—or council—of Worms in

1521. Dr. Luther was summoned here by the Emperor, in the hope that he would either not appear, or if he did, would recant or renounce his teachings. Here was born that immortal saying, "Here I stand: I cannot do otherwise. God help me." The translation of the Scriptures into the language of the German people while residing at the Wartburg Castle, to which place his friends had taken him for safety, from the pope.

11. Who was Luther's able assistant? (A). Philip Melancton.
12. What writing expresses the teaching of the Lutheran Church? (A). The Augsburg Confession.
13. Why and when formulated? (A). It is called the Augsburg Confession because it was presented at Augsburg, to the German Emperor, Charles V. at a council called by him in an attempt to settle the difference between the Lutherans and the Roman Church. It is a statement of what the former believed and taught.  
It was presented in June 25, 1530.
14. Of how many articles is it composed? (A). Twenty-one in which there is set forth the positive teaching of the Lutheran Church. There are also seven articles in which are reviewed the abuses which have been corrected.
15. Of what do they teach? (A). 1. On God. 2. On Original Sin. 3. On the Son of God and His Mediatorial Work. 4. On Justification. 5. On the Ministerial Office. 6. On New Obediences. 7. On the Church. 8. What the Church is. 9. On Baptism. 10. On the Lord's Supper. 11. On Confession. 12. On Repentance. 13. On the use of the Sacraments. 14. On Church Orders. 15. On Church Rites. 16. On Civil Affairs. 17. On Christ's Return to Judgment. 18. On Free Will. 19. On the Cause of Sin. 20. On Good Works. 21. On the Invocation of Saints.

16. What are some other writings of the Lutheran Church? (A). 1. Melancthon's Apology of the Augsburg Confession. 2. The Larger and Smaller Catechisms of Luther. 3. The Smalcald Articles. 4. The Formula of Concord.
17. What is Luther's Small Catechism? (A). It is a "Short summary in questions and answers of what God's word teaches concerning faith and life."
18. Why and when was it made? (A). It was made in response to the great need of religious teaching noted by Luther. With the opening up of the religious awakening under him, the awful ignorance of the Bible came to light. This was his attempt to satisfy this need. His example has been followed by every religious movement or body since it was made in 1529, thus making it the oldest Catechism of any importance, in existence: That by the Roman Catholic Church not being issued till some few years later.
19. How many parts has it? (A). It has five parts: 1. The Ten Commandments. 2. The Apostles' Creed. 3. The Lord's Prayer. 4. Baptism. 5. The Lord's Supper.
20. Does the Lutheran Church believe in formalism? (A). By no means. It does however believe in good form. No public service was ever conducted without some kind of a form. The Lutheran Church believes in a good form, as over against a poor one. Thus she has her beautiful service to both begin and close her public worship, by which her people are prepared for that which is everything to the heart of the Lutheran—the hearing of the Word of God. If the pastor is robed, it is only that that Word may be given greater emphasis and greater and easier access to the mind and heart of the people. Everything is done decently and in order, that men may be brought in mind and heart nearer to their God.

21. How does one come into the Lutheran Church? (A). There are three recognized forms of entry: 1. Confirmation. 2. Baptism. 3. By letter.
22. What constitutes membership in the Lutheran Church? (A). Membership in the Lutheran Church is not dependent upon any amount of money that may be given, but upon the individual attitude toward the Lord's Supper. If the heart is right it will be evidenced by attendance at the table of the Lord and not by the paying of a certain amount to the Church. This does not excuse any member from giving toward the Lord's work however. Not only does the Church expect him to give if at all able, but does so upon the teaching of the Bible. It does not expect any more or less than this book. It accepts the New Testament rule of 'giving as God has prospered.'
23. How many Lutherans are there in the world? (A). There are near 76,000,000 Lutherans in the world, more than all the other protestant denominations combined.
24. How many Lutherans in America? (A). There were in 1912 near two and a half million Lutherans in this country. There are however, 13,000,000 baptized members in America. While these are divided up into four large general bodies—the General Synod organized in 1820; the General Council organized in 1867; the Synodical Conference organized in 1872; and the United Synod South, organized in 1886—and 15 Independent Synods, yet the faith of the Lutheran Church the world over is the same. All stand upon the word of God and the Augsburg Confession as fully setting forth its teachings on the fundamental facts.





# CONTENTS:

	Page
Forword .....	5
Study I—The Doctrine of the Bible.....	7
Its Nativity .....	8
Its Nature .....	11
A Brief Synopsis of the Bible.....	13
Study II—The Doctrine of God.....	15
How Can I Know There is a God.....	15
What is He.....	19
Study III—The Doctrine of Man: The State of Innocence.....	25
His Origin .....	26
Did God Create Man?.....	27
Why Did God Create Man?.....	28
Study IV—The Doctrine of Man: The State of Sin.....	30
What is It?.....	30
Where Sin was Destined to Lead Man.....	32
Study V—The Doctrine of Man: The State of Grace.....	35
The Author of Salvation.....	36
When was Redemption Determined for Man?.....	38
Study VI—The Doctrine of Christ: His Person.....	40
What He Is.....	40
His Names .....	40
His Natures .....	41
Study VII—The Doctrine of Christ: His Life.....	46
His State of Humiliation.....	46
His State of Exaltation.....	48
Study VIII—The Doctrine of Christ: His Work.....	52
The Reason for Redemption.....	53
How He Redeemed Me.....	54
Study IX—The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.....	59
His Person .....	60
His Work .....	61
The Results of His Work.....	63
Study X—The Doctrine of Salvation.....	65
The Nature of Salvation.....	65
The Necessity of Salvation.....	66
The Condition of Salvation.....	67
Study XI—The Doctrine of Sin.....	71
What is It?.....	71
Why is Sin?.....	73
The Attitude of God Toward Sin.....	74

Study XII—The Doctrine of Prayer.....	77
What Prayer Is.....	78
To Whom Should We Pray?.....	80
For What Should We Pray?.....	81
Study XIII—The Doctrine of Baptism: Its Nature and Necessity....	83
The Nature of Baptism.....	83
Its Necessity .....	86
Study XIV—The Doctrine of Baptism: The Mode.....	89
From Reason .....	89
From Revelation .....	90
The Bible and Baptism.....	92
Study XV—The Doctrine of Baptism: Its Subjects.....	98
The Testimony of the Word of God.....	99
Study XVI—The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.....	106
Its Power .....	107
Its Preparation .....	117
Study XVII—The Doctrine of Last Things.....	119
Death .....	119
The Resurrection .....	122
The Final Judgment.....	123
The End of the World.....	125
Eternal Death for the Lost and Eternal Life for the Saved....	125
Appendix A. The Apostles' Creed.....	130
Appendix B. The Ten Commandments.....	133
Appendix C. Two Dozen Questions and Answers on Lutheranism....	137



NOV 14 1918

UN  
8065

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 064 252 3